

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

MR. C. S. LEWIS'S book, *Miracles*,¹ is called 'A Preliminary Study,' because the question whether miracles occur can never be answered either by experience or by history. By experience, because our senses are not infallible; by history, because history never provides mathematically demonstrative evidence. Experience and history depend on the kind of philosophy we bring to them. It is no use consulting either until we have some idea about the possibility or probability of the miraculous. And it is with this preliminary question the book is concerned.

We naturally, therefore, begin with the issue between Naturalism and Supernaturalism. The Naturalist believes that the ultimate fact, the thing you can't go behind, is a vast process in space and time which is *going on of its own accord*. Inside that total system every particular event happens because some other event has happened; in the long-run because the Total Event is happening. All the things and events are so completely interlocked that no one of them can claim the slightest independence from 'the whole show.' And, of course, no thoroughgoing Naturalist believes in free-will. Spontaneity, action 'on its own,' is a privilege reserved for 'the whole show,' which he calls Nature.

The Supernaturalist agrees with the Naturalist that there must be something which exists in its own right; some basic Fact whose existence it would be nonsensical to try to explain because the Fact is itself the ground or starting-point of all explanations. But he does not identify this Fact with 'the whole show.' He thinks that things fall into two classes. In the first class we find either things or (more probably) One Thing which is basic and original, which exists on its own. In the second we find things which are merely derivative from that One Thing. The

one basic thing has caused all other things to be. It exists on its own; they exist because it exists.

What undermines Naturalism is this, that all possible knowledge depends on the validity of reasoning, and that no thought is valid if it can be fully explained as the result of irrational causes. Now it would clearly be preposterous to apply this rule to each particular thought as we come to it and yet not to apply it to all thoughts taken collectively, that is, to human reason as a whole. Each particular thought is valueless if it is the result of irrational causes. Obviously, then, the whole process of human thought, what we call Reason, is equally valueless if it is the result of irrational causes. Hence every theory of the universe which makes the human mind a result of irrational causes is inadmissible.

But Naturalism is precisely a theory of that sort. The mind, like every other particular thing or event, is supposed to be simply the product of the Total System. It is supposed to be that and nothing more, to have no power whatever of 'going on of its own accord.' And the Total System is not supposed to be rational. All thoughts whatever are therefore the results of irrational causes, and nothing more than that. The finest piece of scientific reasoning is caused in just the same irrational way as the thoughts a man has because a bit of bone is pressing on his brain.

If this argument is sound, rational thought or Reason is not interlocked with the great interlocking system of irrational events which we call Nature. When we are asked to believe in Reason coming from non-reason we must cry Halt, for, if we don't, all thought is discredited. It is therefore obvious that sooner or later you must admit a Reason which exists absolutely on its own. Can you or I be this self-existent Reason? Obviously, no, for a Reason that exists on its

¹ Geoffrey Bles; 10s. 6d. net.

own must have existed from all eternity. Human minds are supernatural entities in the strictest sense, but they are not the only supernatural entities that exist. Each has come into Nature from Supernature and has its tap-root in an eternal, self-existent, rational Being.

If the Supernaturalist is right, still that does not prove that miracles occur. We have to find a criterion of probability to make them acceptable. Now the objections to miracle are of two kinds, one from the side of Nature, the other from the side of the Supernature. The first is, of course, the idea that miracle breaks the laws of Nature. But, so far is this from being true, Nature accepts and 'digests' the miracle with perfect ease and harmonizes it in a twinkling with all other events. It is one bit of raw material for the laws to apply to. One event has been thrown into the general cataract of events, and it finds itself at home there and conforms to all other events.

The other objection to the miraculous is from the side of the Supernatural. God would not go 'out of His way' to work a miracle. It is not in His nature. It would be unworthy of Him. He would not commit irregularities. But this objection only applies to the popular vague conception of God as the Principle in things, a spiritual force pervading all things, a 'pool of generalized spirituality.' It does not apply to the Christian faith in a God who does things, a concrete, choosing, commanding, prohibiting God with a determinate character. The popular, pantheistic religion excludes miracles because it excludes the living God and holds by a God who would not do miracles or indeed anything else.

This brief summary of an argument that is often intricate, sometimes a trifle difficult but always absorbing and frequently beautifully illustrated, must conclude with some indication of what Mr. LEWIS has to say of 'the Grand Miracle,' which, of course, is the Incarnation.

'In science,' writes Professor Whitehead, 'we sometimes have convictions which we cherish but cannot justify; we are influenced by some innate sense of the fitness of things.' Mr. LEWIS quotes this and has it much in his mind in the fine chapter about the central miracle. We cannot conceive how the Divine Spirit dwelled with the created and human spirit of Jesus; but neither can we conceive how His human spirit, or that of any man, dwells within his natural organism. What we can understand, if the Christian doctrine is true, is that our own composite existence is not the sheer anomaly it might seem to be, but a

faint image of the Divine Incarnation itself—the same theme in a very minor key.

We can understand that if God so descends into a human spirit, and human spirit so descends into Nature, and our thoughts into our senses, and if adult minds (but only the best of them) can descend into sympathy with children, and men into sympathy with beasts, then everything hangs together and the total reality, both natural and supernatural, in which we are living is more multifariously and subtly harmonious than we had suspected. We catch sight of a new principle—the power of the Higher, just in so far as it is truly Higher, to come down, the power of the greater to include the less. Everywhere the great enters the little—its power to do so is almost the test of its greatness.

In the Christian story God descends to re-ascend. He goes down to come up again and bring the whole ruined world up with Him. One has the picture of a strong man stooping lower and lower to get himself underneath some great complicated burden. He must stoop in order to lift, he must almost disappear under the load before he incredibly straightens his back and marches off with the whole mass swaying on his shoulders. In this descent and re-ascent we recognize a familiar pattern, a thing written all over the life of the world. Through this bottle-neck, this belittlement, the high-road nearly always lies.

Enough will have been written to show that this is a remarkable book. Mr. LEWIS is always terribly clever, and in nothing more so than in the brilliance of his illustrations. But in this book there is a pervading seriousness befitting the greatness of his theme. It is a book that will repay (and need) re-reading.

The Rev. John Stewart LAWTON, M.A., B.D., in a thesis accepted for the degree of B.D. at the University of Oxford, has offered a Study of British and American Christology, from 1889–1914—*Conflict in Christology*.¹ By Christology he understands (and it is the strict meaning of the term) the relation of the Deity and humanity in Christ. The period he has selected for treatment is from the publication of 'Lux Mundi' to the outbreak of the first World War. It is the period that may come to be known as the 'liberal' era of English theology.

The 'liberals' did not all see eye to eye with each other. They might be broadly divided into

¹ S.P.C.K.; 2os. net.

the two groups of the 'moderates' and the 'radicals.' These were at one in being opposed to the 'conservatives.' And the 'conflict' between 'liberals' and conservatives' was maintained throughout the period under review. As it was ushered in from the 'liberal' side by 'Lux Mundi,' so also was it from the 'conservative' side, and in the same year, 1889, by W. G. Shedd's 'Dogmatic Theology.'

Mr. LAWTON's aim in these pages is not to assess the value of liberal theology as compared with conservative theology, but rather to contrast it with conservative theology in order to bring out its characteristics. In a word, his aim is historical and descriptive. While one would have welcomed a full critical discussion of the issues involved in the conflict under review, one realizes that the essayist's self-imposed limits are in keeping with his purpose of submitting the study as an academical thesis. None the less a critical attitude distinctly leaning towards 'conservatism' makes its appearance now and again in the course of the study.

In a rapid survey of ancient Christology the essayist notes that the liberal theologians of the English-speaking world took as the two foundations of their Christology the basic interests of each of the two Patristic schools. With the Antiochenes they insisted upon Christ's true and complete humanity; like the Alexandrians, upon His personal unity. He even claims that in the period of which he treats the two principles of true humanity and personal unity were brought into proximity by the same school of thought for the first time in the history of Christian doctrine. The result was, however, not a new and adequate Christology but a crisis of great moment.

The crisis was provoked by one particular symptom of Christ's humanity, namely, His limited knowledge, which the higher criticism had brought home to the minds of Biblical students. It was to account for His limited knowledge that the Kenotic theory was put forward. This theory, in Britain and America as well as in Germany, was a movement within orthodoxy. Among the English Kenoticists of whom the essayist gives an account are James Macpherson, A. M. Fairbairn, Charles Gore, P. T. Forsyth, and H. R. Mackintosh.

When once the discussion of Christ's mind had been opened up, it was not to be expected that the debate would be concerned merely with the

limitation of His knowledge. There arose a new study of the growth and contents of His consciousness, and much stress was laid on the value of the 'psychological approach.' This tended to put a severe strain on the Kenotic theory, and the tendency was further increased when the critical picture of Jesus became more and more severed from the traditional theology. For the Kenotic theory, as the essayist says, attempted to combine elements from two totally different worlds of thought—ancient reason and modern rationalism.

The essayist makes a brave effort to classify the 'liberal' Christologies. But the usefulness of his book lies not so much in the classifications as in the accounts he gives of the Christological ideas of individual theologians. He rightly says that James Martineau and all who, like him, delineate a purely humanitarian Jesus are not Christologians in the proper sense. So he passes from them and dwells rather on writers like A. E. Garvie with his Ritschlian standpoint, George Tyrrell with his 'eschatologism,' R. J. Campbell with his 'immanentism,' and Edward Caird with his interpretation of Christ in idealistic terms.

From the more radical types of liberal Christology, in which the central figure is little related to the Christ of traditional Christian belief, the essayist turns to writers who sought to preserve the classic doctrine of Christ's Divinity, while facing the difficulty of it for modern thought. Frank Weston, operating with the modern idealistic concept of personality, gives a 'theocentric' solution, in which the centre of the consciousness and personality of the Incarnate Lord is represented as the Divine ego. William Sanday, operating with the idea of the subliminal consciousness, gives an 'anthropocentric' solution, in which the subliminal consciousness is represented as the *locus* for Divine activity in the human soul. John Caird gives a 'neo-Antiochene' solution on Hegelian lines, believing that the Divinity of Christ was a Divinity that was capable of being expressed in a human life and through a human personality.

The essayist's own 'conservatism' seems to be adumbrated in his closing remark that those who do not begin with the fundamental Christian assumption, 'The Word was made flesh,' but with the postulate that Christ was a complete man, cannot but end in some such 'speculation' as John Caird's, that is, if they attempt to show how such a complete man as they suppose Christ to have been was united to God.

The Unity of the New Testament.

New Testament Ethics.

BY PROFESSOR T. W. MANSON, D.D., F.B.A., THE UNIVERSITY, MANCHESTER.

WE are all familiar with the statement in print or conversation that if only the principles of the Sermon on the Mount were applied to human affairs the Golden Age would arrive. And we all think we know the answer. We declare, quite rightly, that the Christian Faith and the Christian Ethic are inseparable. 'No simplification of the early Christian Faith into the ethics of benevolence, cheerfulness, and pacifism will easily satisfy a conscience concerned to deal fairly with historical evidence.'¹ And the historical evidence presents us with God in Christ reconciling the world to Himself as a logical prius to any new demands. 'Neither do I condemn thee' precedes 'Go . . . henceforth sin no more.' The *kerygma*, the proclamation of what God has done, leads up to the *didache*, the instruction in the Christian way of life. All this is eminently true; and we have only ourselves to thank that it is not better known. Too long we have been trying to purvey a diluted Faith and a doctrinaire Ethic to the outside world. Too long it has been understood by the average man that an enlightened presentation of Christianity means a vague idea of the Fatherhood of God and the leadership of Jesus coupled with the notion that if we would all accept the Sermon on the Mount, the world would be made safe for democracy. A minimum of doctrine and a maximum of 'practical Christianity' would usher in the millennium. There are a number of obvious comments to be made on this programme.

(1) There is a certain artlessness, not to say *naïveté*, in the supposition that a world that finds the Ten Commandments intolerably irksome will rush to take upon itself the much more searching and exacting requirements of the Sermon on the Mount.

(2) It is equally artless to suppose that any one can even begin to tackle the Sermon on the Mount without the maximum help of Divine grace, which, if it is to be seriously sought, requires something more lively in the way of faith than a willingness to allow for the sake of argument that there may be a God, and that the word 'Father' may be a fairly apt description of Him.

(3) There is a certain lack of realism in the attempt to isolate the Christian Ethic, not only from the Christian Faith, but also from the

Christian Society, the Body of Christ. The sad truth that the Church has not always been conspicuously successful in putting the Christian Ethic into practice, and has on occasion conspicuously failed, does not alter the fact that the Christian Ethic is the ideal set up in the Church for the Church, and that like charity it must begin at home. Jesus said to His disciples (Mk 10^{42 f.}): 'Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you.' That is fundamental to Christian Ethics: what is or is not done among Christians. And it is a matter of historic fact that the Christian Ethic has been, and still is, effective on the world from within the Christian community. At the present day there is no lack of high ideals and fine speeches on the subject, for example, of health services and the relief of physical suffering; and in India not less than elsewhere. Yet at a recent meeting on medical work in India we were told that when it comes to putting noble ideals into practice in the often disagreeable, sometimes dangerous, and always arduous work of nursing, eighty per cent. of the recruits come from the Christian Church, and ninety per cent. are trained in Christian institutions. That is to say the Christian Ethic expresses itself not primarily in hypothetical sentences of the form 'If only they would . . . then there would be . . .', but in categorical imperatives which are all variations on the one theme, 'Follow me.' The Christian Ethic is the way of life of those who are disciples of Jesus, citizens of the Kingdom of God. It is a life lived under grace. Its results in action are fruits of the Spirit that has been bestowed by God. At the same time they are acts of obedience to the law of Christ and tokens of His disciples' love to Him and to one another.

'Follow me'; 'Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ'; 'If ye love me, keep my commandments'; 'Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus.' In all these, and many more sayings from the New Testament, the underlying idea is that the vocation, motive, and pattern of Christian living are to be found in Christ Himself. So that the revelation of Deity and the mould of humanity may be expressed in the one word Christlikeness.

¹ G. O. Griffith, *Racialism and World Faith*, 150.

Now historically the most significant fact about Jesus Christ is the unanimity with which believers and unbelievers, friends and enemies, have accepted the word 'Ministry' as the word to describe His public career. When we talk about 'the Ministry,' with a capital M, everybody knows what we have in mind: the Ministry that sets the standard and pattern for all true service of God and our neighbour. Theologically it is equally significant that it pleased God to effect our salvation in Christ and through His ministry. Historically the most significant thing about the life of Christians is the degree to which people who cross our path are compelled to call our life a ministry. Theologically the most significant thing about the life-ministries of Christians is the fact that God is pleased to use them to continue the work of Christ in the Church which is His Body.

Accordingly Christian Ethics is primarily the Imitation of Christ in the sense that Christ is the master-craftsman of the whole art and mystery of living as a man among men, and His disciples are His apprentices who learn to live by living with Him and under His direction. It follows that, however important and instructive particular sayings or collections of sayings of Jesus may be, they are not themselves the last word. They are elements in a total which is made up of all our historical information about Jesus together with the continuing guidance and illumination of His Spirit in the individual lives of believers and in the common life of the Christian community. It is this total that is in fact the light and power of Christian behaviour throughout the centuries. The hard facts of the Gospel record are there to check the inveterate tendency to regard our own inclinations as the 'mind of Christ'; and the day-to-day gift of the Spirit is there to save us from turning such things as the Sermon on the Mount into a legal bondage more intolerable than that from which St. Paul broke loose.

The Imitation of Christ, then, is nothing less than entering into the continuing Ministry of Christ, first by being the object of it and then by sharing in its tasks. This is expressed in another way in the Synoptic Gospels by saying that the Kingdom of God has drawn near to men or has reached them, and calling upon men to enter it. In the one case the Kingdom brings gifts to men, in the other it makes demands upon them. The primary function of a 'disciple' is to receive from the Master; that of an 'apostle' is to give out of what he has received to others. Here lies the paradox of Christian Ethics, that the Christian in his life-ministry can have only one Master, yet must be the servant of all. He can have only one obedience yet must be at the service of all. This ideal of unconditional loyalty and

obedience coupled with free service has its primary realization in the Christian community, the Body of Christ. In that body all the members share the same single loyalty and are committed to the same free service of the brethren. It is a real classless society where all differences are overcome, not by levelling down, but by levelling up. 'One is your Master and you are all brethren.' Men receive 'the glorious liberty of the children of God'—and, it may be added, the glorious equality and the glorious fraternity of the children of God. Now it will hardly be denied that the unconditional obedience to the One, coupled with free and sacrificial service of the many, is characteristic of the Ministry of Jesus as recorded in the Synoptic tradition. We see it most clearly at the supreme point of the Ministry, the Passion: 'The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many'; and 'Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt.' It is also clear that this is perceived to be the essential thing about the Ministry by the New Testament writers.

St. Paul sets the Christian ideal of behaviour before the Philippian by inviting them to have the mind that was also in Christ Jesus, and the characteristic features of that mind are willing obedience to God's will and loving service of men, both carried out to the death, even the death of the Cross (Ph 2⁵⁻¹¹; cf. Ro 15¹⁻²). The Epistle to the Hebrews finds the secret of Christ's Ministry in His obedience to God (5⁶⁻¹⁰ 10⁵⁻⁷) and in His sympathy with men (3¹⁷ 4¹⁵ 5²). Similarly in the Johannine tradition Jesus declares 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work' (Jn 4³⁴), and 'I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me' (5³⁰; cf. 6³⁸ 8²⁹ 12⁵⁰ 15¹⁰, with application to the disciples). So in His relation to men the essential thing is love which knows no limit to its self-giving (Jn 10^{11. 15. 17. 18} 13^{37. 38} 15¹³, 1 Jn 3¹⁶). The thought is already found in Paul (Gal 2²⁰), and has its roots in the Synoptic tradition (Mk 10⁴⁵). The New Testament writers with one accord show themselves awed by the perfect devotion of Jesus to God and fascinated by His perfect devotion to men. In the Ministry, above all in the Passion, they find the *mysterium tremendum et fascinans*, the mystery of the Kingdom of God.

As already indicated, the pursuit of this ideal is not a solitary excursion: it is a sharing in 'the common life in the Body of Christ.' And it becomes increasingly evident that this was part of the intention of Jesus. The Church was not, in my judgment, the unforeseen after-effect of the Ministry: it was conceived as an integral part of

the Ministry. Jesus deliberately set out to create a new kind of social organism of which He Himself was the nucleus. The Church began with the Ministry. It began as a Church of one member. It began to grow with the call of the first disciples; and the moment that two or three were gathered round Jesus the understanding of what was done or not done in that group began. The fuller implications were drawn out as the Ministry progressed towards its inevitable consummation. They were not accepted without protest by the disciples; and they were not abated by Jesus. It became increasingly clear that, in the words of Professor J. W. Bowman, 'Jesus Himself is the new Torah in His own person.'¹ He Himself is the way, the truth, and the life. Christian Ethics is the life of Christ: in the first instance the life lived in the early decades of the first century in Galilee and Judæa; and then the continuing life lived in the Church which He created and in which He carries on His ministry.

At this point the problem of Christian Ethics becomes twofold. There is first the question of standards of behaviour within the Christian community, and, second, the relation of the community and its members to the non-Christian environment. Within the Church there should be no problem: for the Church is the society within which the law of Christ *is* the law; where the members are so intimately bound together in the common life that what injures one is felt as an injury by all, and what benefits one is felt as a benefit by all. Within this community the whole writ of the Sermon on the Mount runs. The whole life of the Church is to be an exegesis of the word 'Christ,' just as the life of Christ is an exegesis of the word 'God' (cf. Jn 1¹⁸ and Sir 43³¹). Consequently things which appear normal and just in other social groupings have no place in this community. For example, in Lk 12¹³⁻¹⁴ we have the blank refusal of Jesus to arbitrate in a dispute between two brothers regarding an inheritance. It is clear that He does not begin to ask what is the correct decision in the case: He demands to know what right the case has to exist at all. Some twenty years later a similar situation arises in the Corinthian Church and we see St. Paul taking a similar stand (1 Co 6¹⁻¹¹). In his case the matter is complicated by the fact that the disputants are taking the case to the secular court. The Apostle is indignant that this should even be contemplated. It is certainly a disgrace that nobody can be found in the Church to adjudicate. But that is not all. The real tragedy of the whole business is that between brethren there should be the kind of quarrel that calls for arbitration at all, Christian or pagan. On this and many another thing the

last word is the Word of Jesus. 'It is not so among you'; and in detail appeal can be made to the example or precept of the Master. In other cases, where there is no express guidance from the past, Christians must do their best to be receptive and obedient to the prompting of the Spirit. This we can see happening in the very next chapter of 1 Corinthians (7²⁹⁻³¹), where the question is the re-marriage of Christian widows. St. Paul gives his own opinion, adding: 'And I think also that I have the Spirit of God.' The content of the Christian Ethic is thus not a fixed code, but a living, growing body of practice containing traditional elements and constantly adding new ones as the result of facing life's challenges in the Spirit of Christ.

The second and more complex problem is the relation of the community and its members to the non-Christian world. That complete spiritual isolationism was not a possible policy was early perceived (1 Co 5⁹⁻¹³). For one thing the mere business of living at all in the world involves the Church and its members in all kinds of relations with other people and institutions. And, what is even more important, the Church has an Apostolic ministry to the world, which cannot be exercised by issuing communiqués from a Christian enclave set in the midst of, but carefully sequestered from, its non-Christian surroundings. A single example is the case of Church and State. In the days of the earthly Ministry the problem obtruded itself in more ways than one: it found one expression in the question: 'Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar or not?' Concerning our Lord's reply it is correct to say that He refuses to arbitrate between Jewish nationalism and Roman imperialism, much less to take sides with one or the other. But that is not the whole story. The injunction to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and to God the things that are God's recognizes that there is a real problem to be solved, and that the claims of Cæsar are real claims, which are made not less but more real by being subordinated to those of God. For subordination implies some kind of recognition. The rest of the New Testament, with one exception, follows the line laid down in this saying of Jesus. Typical is the teaching of St. Paul in Ro 13¹⁻⁷. Here we have the idea of a Church whose members, by their very church membership, are made more loyal citizens, more enlightened in their understanding of the State and its task in the world, more sensitive to the great issues of justice and social order. Hence the Christian in the Empire must be loyal to the Empire. Common prudence would counsel this; for, as Edwyn Bevan justly remarked, 'At the time when St. Paul wrote Rom. xiii., the only alternative to the Imperial Roman Government was

¹ *The Intention of Jesus*, 201.

anarchy.' ¹ But the real reason for loyalty is that the State is under God and established by God, and the civil ruler in the discharge of his proper tasks is performing a service to God. His proper tasks are the encouragement of good and the suppression of evil conduct, in other words the maintenance of order and justice. Government is a Divine service, and therefore the Christian citizen has a duty to the Government as the Government has to God. He must pay rates and taxes and he must give due respect and honour to those whose place in the order of society entitles them to these things.

With the positions laid down in Ro 13 we may compare 2 Th 2³⁻⁸, 1 Ti 2¹⁻⁴, Tit 3^{1ff}, 1 P 2¹³⁻¹⁷. The First Epistle of Clement contains a prayer for the Government (lx. f.). Polycarp in his Letter to the Philippians commends prayer for the Emperors and other rulers (xii. 3); and at his trial he speaks of the Christian teaching that honour should be paid to the authorities appointed by God (*Mart. Pol.*, x. 2). Similar statements may be found in Justin Martyr's first *Apology* (xvii.), and even in the truculent Tertullian (*ad Scapulam*, 2; *Apol.*, 30). In sharp contrast to all this is the attitude found in the Apocalypse, where Rome is the harlot drunk with the blood of the saints, and the Emperor is the Beast demanding worship from men. This violent change from the teaching of Jesus and Paul may perhaps best be explained by two circumstances: (a) the fact that Jewish Messianism survives here, baptized indeed, but not fully converted to Christianity; and (b) that the author was scandalized and outraged by the growth of the Imperial cult. All this is quite understandable, yet it remains true that the attitude taken up in the Apocalypse is exceptional.

I have discussed the Church-and-State issue at some length, partly because it is typical, partly because it is still a very live issue. There are, of course, others. The question of the relation of the Church and the church-member to the Family arises in the Ministry of Jesus and in the Apostolic

¹ In *The Kingdom of God and History*, 66.

Age; and it must be said that, while the Family as an institution is given its full value, it is kept in its place. 'Render to the Family the things that are the Family's and to God the things that are God's' might well be the word here. And, once more, by making *patria potestas* or the like subordinate to God its true virtue is recognized in the very act that deprives it of its arbitrariness.² We could go on to consider other forms of social grouping, each of which has its task to do, under God and in the service of God, each of which has to discover the best way of performing its task. None of these institutions is an end in itself. All are under God and all are for the service of men. The Church is in idea the most comprehensive of all, and is allotted the largest and most exacting task of all—that of continuing the Ministry of Jesus. That task is being done when the Church makes converts; deepens and strengthens her own inner life and unity; and breeds men and women whose influence as citizens makes justice more effective and freedom more real, whose life as members of families makes family life purer and happier, who, in short, are such that men behold their good works and glorify their Father who is in heaven.

To sum up. New Testament Ethics is the Ethics of a saved community. It is the discovery and the doing of the perfect will of God by sharing in the life of Christ. It is apprenticeship to the Master of all good life. It is the achievement of love which is the bond of perfection in the community which is the Body of Christ. It is the Apostolic offering of what has been won in the Church for the welfare of all human souls and for the strengthening of every institution that, under God, serves that welfare. The full nature of its task and of the methods to be used is found in the doing of it: the Spirit in which it was begun and must be continued is the Spirit of Jesus.

² On Jesus and the Family I may refer to the excellent discussion by Professor E. F. Scott, in *Man and Society in the New Testament*, 73 ff.

Literature.

ENGLISH DISSENT.

ENGLISH Nonconformists will not be alone in finding interest in a little book, *English Dissent under the Early Hanoverians* (Epworth Press; 6s. net), by Duncan Coomer, M.A. It starts off with a rapid account of the three principal denominations of those days—the Presbyterians, the Independents, and the Baptists—enabling us to see their life and worship, the doctrinal controversies

by which they were faced and sometimes shaken, their relationship to the State and much else—all graphic, helpful, and informing. And, finally, there is a chapter, as useful as any, on the Impact of Methodism on Dissent. 'It may come as a surprise to learn that the Methodist Revival of the eighteenth century was at first greeted with almost complete hostility by Dissent. Yet such was the case.' Great names are summoned as witnesses to this; and their evidence is conclusive.

The Presbyterians, with their training for, and ordination to, the ministry, looked askance at lay preachers. The Baptists felt that these newcomers were poaching in their own preserves, the labouring classes. The Independents saw in Methodism a needless rival in their own type of religion. All alike disliked the autocracy of Wesley; and, even more, the man himself. And the Wesleys had certainly asked for it. 'We are not Seceders, nor do we bear any resemblance to them. The Seceders laid the foundation of their work in judging others; we laid the foundation of our work in judging and condemning ourselves.' So John. While Charles once told a man, 'Rather than see thee a Dissenting minister I wish to see thee smiling in thy coffin.' All which, to us looking back at it, is small and painful.

Or, again, what an egregious muddle the English Presbyterians made of their enormous possibilities and chances. At one time they seemed well upon the way to become the Church of England. And to-day they have dwindled to a little sect, meagre indeed in point of numbers. And even this is a real revival from an even lowlier state. Why this debacle? For one thing, they were not wisely led. And, inexplicably enough, they were largely submerged, at one time, by a wave of Arianism of all things. Hence a most distinguished history teacher of this generation used to define a Presbyterian to her classes as one who did not believe in the divinity of Christ—a statement as libellous as it was ignorant. Though Newman wrote complacently, 'Had I been born an English Presbyterian, perhaps I should never have known our Lord's divinity.' But then every one agrees how limited was Newman's knowledge. But, to a Presbyterian looking on from outside, it looks as if the English mind had not enough church sense to be able to understand and practise Presbyterianism. Such of that nation as adopted it ran up a crude makeshift utility affair, but little likely to succeed; and not the system as one sees it, say, in Ireland or Scotland. Yet even that went further than the average Englishman of those days cared to go. He was contented with his Parish Church, or with his Congregational Chapel, and did not seem to feel the thrill of the Church Catholic, which is inbred in every Presbyterian by the very system—sessions, presbyteries, synods, General Assembly—leading his mind out and out. And unmistakably the average man of those days showed his preference, as he had every right to do.

A. J. GOSSIP.

OUR DEBT TO ANTIQUITY.

The Legacy of the Ancient World, by W. G. de Burgh, M.A., late Professor Emeritus of Philosophy in the University of Reading, Fellow of the British Academy (MacDonald and Evans; 21s. net).

If Dr. Collis is right in his contention (in his recent book 'Straight On') that the salvation of Europe is to be found in a fresh discovery of our oneness in the culture not only of Christendom but of Rome and Greece, this book of Professor de Burgh ought to exercise a wholesome and unifying

influence on our sadly divided Continent. For it traces with consummate skill the contribution of each of the great systems, Israel, Greece, and Rome, to our civilization and shows how the separate strands have been woven together into a real unity. 'Each created and bequeathed to after ages one of the essentials in the idea of a complete civilization. The Greeks were the first to realize the worth of individual liberty as the soil wherein alone man's imagination and intellect can flourish and bear fruit. But man is called upon to act, and the effective realization of his purposes . . . can be accomplished only by aid of external authority and government. This disciplinary function in the history of civilization was fulfilled by Rome. But alike in the field of thought and action the spirit of man is doomed to waste in anarchy or bondage unless inspired by the knowledge of its ideal goal. "Where there is no vision the people perish." The Hebrews had seen the vision, and they transmitted it, through a faith that had its roots in the spiritual life of Israel, to the Aryan peoples of the West. Freedom, Law, and the Kingdom of God: these form the threefold legacy of antiquity to the modern world.'

So Professor de Burgh summarizes his theme, as he sets out on the long journey from far behind the Christian era to the present day. And towards the end of the journey he pauses to reflect on how Christianity has absorbed the three earlier systems in its own construction. In Christ ideal and actuality, value and fact, were one. All the happenings in this transitory world, the whole course of history, were but an episode in the unfolding of the Divine purpose, which included all mankind and all their activities. The Kingdom of God is the one permanent reality.

Professor de Burgh begins with the early civilizations of the East, and then proceeds to the Religion of Israel, the Rise of Hellenism, the Greatness of Athens, the Roman Republic and Empire, Christianity, and the Legacy of the Middle Ages. These are all subjects that fascinate any cultured mind. And it is delightful to read the writer's exposition of the great eras of thought and discovery; of the great fifth century B.C., for example, splendid with the noblest names of antiquity—Themistocles and Pericles, Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, Aristophanes, Pindar, Herodotus and Thucydides, Socrates and Plato. Was there ever a century that produced such a splendid company of inspired seers, poets, artists, and philosophers? Professor de Burgh dwells with obvious delight on the wonderful phenomenon of Greek thought and its influence on mankind, on the birth of science under its ægis, of philosophy and of humanism, and insists on the penetrating influence of Hellenism through Neo-Platonism on Christian theology. One of the most remarkable passages in a brilliant survey is the relation of Greek thought to the metaphysical doctrine of the Trinity. His well-balanced mind recognizes that the Trinitarian formula was not the result of speculation but of religious experience. Nevertheless, he insists that Christian thought was vitally assisted by the contention of the Greeks (like that of Hegel) that

reality was constituted by a synthesis of unity and plurality. Hellenism believed that a bare unity of being is inconceivable, and Christian theologians followed this belief in their interpretation of the Divine nature.

But it is impossible to discuss, or even to mention, many of the enlightening points in this remarkable survey of European and Near-European thought. The book is a history of that great evolution of human thought upon the problems of existence which has flowed on in a great and ever enriched stream until the present day. It is a book for which to be devoutly thankful. And it will, in this enlarged edition, afford both pleasure and profit to many, as it has from the first page to the last to one reader.

F. J. RAE.

PURITAN ARCHITECTURE.

Architecture has a special future at the present time, and those who have adopted the profession have a unique opportunity for exploring its possibilities. Nor can there be many wider fields than the planning and elevation of Non-conformist churches, for this is particularly the time for shaking off the fetters of that traditional severity of style which has produced so many formless buildings. Such, at any rate, is the opinion of Mr. Martin S. Briggs, F.R.I.B.A., who, in his book, *Puritan Architecture and its Future* (Lutterworth Press: 8s. 6d. net), puts forward a strong case for the erection of Non-conformist churches in a style more worthy of their ancestry and more fully expressive of their convictions.

He first reviews the history of the Puritan tradition of building churches which have been satirized as 'machines to worship in.' Then he deals in a practical manner with the architecture of the future. He deprecates the erection of large churches and suggests that a seating capacity of five to six hundred should be the maximum, arguing that when larger congregations are found, it is due to the ephemeral influence of a popular preacher, who, when he has gone, leaves a legacy of a large empty church which is too expensive to maintain. He favours the simple oblong plan of building, with or without an apsidal 'East' end; having two pulpits, one on each side, for the lessons and sermon respectively. He would place the Communion Table centrally against the 'East' wall, and the organ and choir in a small gallery at the 'West' end. There is nothing new in this plan. It was one of the earliest forms of the Church in Rome.

Most of the many excellent illustrations show a marked advance in architectural achievement, notably Immanuel Congregational Church, Southbourne, Hants; the Congregational Church at Oxted, Surrey, and the Methodist Church at Timperley, Cheshire. These are fine examples of departure from traditional lines while keeping that feeling of a church which is sometimes lost in modern architecture. Among these illustrations room might have been found for examples of modern Gothic, for, as Liverpool Cathedral demon-

strates, the Gothic spirit is still very much alive and can be expressed in many new ways.

Mr. Briggs' book is to be warmly recommended, especially to those facing a building programme. It is well printed and contains a large number of half-tone photographs and some woodcuts.

CHAS. W. BUDDEN.

OLD SOLDIERS NEVER DIE.

Thirty years ago Principal P. T. Forsyth was, through his pulpit and professorial work and his copious literary output, one of the outstanding influences on English religious thought. Like Denney and Mackintosh, he combined a fearless appreciation of the new insights gained by modern scholarship and criticism with a passionate faith in the gospel. The demand for his books has of late been growing, and it is a tribute to their value that the Independent Press, after a generation has passed, should be re-issuing five out of his twenty-five volumes, two of which, *This Life and the Next* (5s. net) and *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* (10s. 6d. net) have now appeared.

Forsyth was a fluent and zestful writer, though admiration for his forceful style may occasionally be clouded by a doubt whether the words do not run away with the argument and the satisfaction lie in the climax of the literary period rather than in the precise yield of truth. He loved phrasing, such as 'the cruciality of the cross,' 'the egoism of God,' 'the fructification of failure,' 'time is sacramental of eternity,' 'art can make our noisy lives seem moments in the energy of the eternal silence.' But all that criticism might say may be gathered from the fact that he himself is pleased to say in one place 'I hope the atmosphere has been luminous even if every thought is not lucid.'

The reader is always aware of the wide theological and philosophical and literary background of the author's thinking and it is remarkable how often he anticipates many of the trends of thought prevailing to-day. From the larger volume here is one sentence: 'We are in a world that has been redeemed, not in one that is being redeemed at a pace varying with the world's thought and progress or with the Church's thought and work.' And the smaller and perhaps finer book—his last—abounds in noble and memorable passages such as this: 'We were created of God not out of His poverty or need of company but out of His overflowing wealth of love and His passion to multiply joy.'

R. W. STEWART.

What Churches of Christ Stand For (Berean Press, Birmingham; 1s. net), by Principal William Robinson, M.A., D.D., of Overdale College, is the somewhat misleading title of a booklet first published in 1926, and issued last year in a third edition, which describes the origin, growth, and message of a nineteenth-century religious movement that began both in America and in Britain much about the same time. The common ground of the founders of 'Churches of Christ' was 'a passion for the unity of the Body of Christ, an

abhorrence of sectarianism and all party spirit, and a deep conviction that no unity could be achieved until the life, faith, and order of the New Testament Church were restored.' The first reason for the present work was to make the movement intelligible to this generation, the second to remedy the lack of 'church consciousness' felt amongst 'Churches of Christ.' The booklet must have already achieved success under both counts.

The Gathered Community (Carey Press; 7s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Robert C. Walton, is yet another volume symptomatic of the growing 'Church-consciousness' of the 'Free' denominations. It is the outcome of study and discussion by a group of younger Baptist ministers, but Mr. Walton is responsible for the final form and shape in which it has appeared. The book offers in the first part a useful conspectus of the 'witness of the past,' dealing with the evidence of the New Testament for the Baptist doctrine of the Church and with the life and thought of the early (seventeenth-century) Baptists. In the second part it seeks to enlist interest in a 'renewal of life,' examining present-day Baptist Church organization and practice, under the headings of the Community of the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments, and suggesting the lines of future progress and the part Baptists may play in the World Church. It is confessedly a limitation of the book that the story of the Baptist Church is confined to the seventeenth century, though we are referred to the Rev. E. A. Payne's 'Fellowship of Believers' for the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. But it is a very competent production both on the historical side (within the aforesaid limits) and on the side of reconstruction; and its irenic note is to be welcomed. While, however, it advocates 'full and unreserved partnership in the Ecumenical Movement,' it is careful to maintain (and many will sympathize with the sentiment) that 'diversity of experience, which, when formulated intellectually, means a diversity of theology with all the tension that involves, is the very lifeblood of the Church.'

The Islington Conference which met for the hundred and thirteenth time last January is the sounding-board of the Evangelical party in the Church of England. Its Report, *Evangelical Essentials* (Church Book Room; 2s. 6d. net), is a reminder that there is a vigorous body of opinion in the Anglican Church which is not infected by the notion that Christianity, if not identical with, at least owes a great debt to Anglicanism, and which stands by the Reformation doctrine that brings everything under the self-authenticating authority of the living Word of God.

It is interesting to note the frank acceptance of the position of being a distinct party within the Church of England, and also the endeavour to profit by the criticism frequently made that Evangelicals tend to undervalue sacramental worship and church fellowship and to treat 'evangelical' and 'low-church' as synonyms.

The finest pages are perhaps the noble vindica-

tion of preaching by the Vicar of Christ Church, Cloughton.

Jewish mediæval folk-lore is not only a closed book to Christians, it is in danger of becoming so even for the Jews themselves. At the end of last century a Russian rabbi, Israel Benjamin Levner, wrote a compendious work on Jewish legend. Part of this, under the title, *The Legends of Israel*, volume I. *From the Creation to the Death of Joseph*, has been translated from the Hebrew by Joel Snowman (James Clarke; 10s. 6d. net). The stories are adaptations of originals in the Talmud and Midrashim and similar sources, and they give a vivid and attractive picture of Jewish ethical ideals in the post-Old Testament period. Here is a reverence for humanity, piety, justice, mercy, and righteousness, which is in distinct contrast to the brutality and exaltation of violence that mark so much of the folk-lore of other peoples. Many of the details in the stories are based upon rabbinical exegesis, which was often extremely fanciful. But if Sarah is a very gracious lady, and not the shrew she sometimes appears in the text of Genesis, it is because passages like the concluding chapter of Proverbs have gone to transform her so. It says much for Jewish piety that stories like these could be told by a people who were often so cruelly persecuted.

Prophecy and the Church, by Dr. Oswald T. Allis (James Clarke; 15s. net), is concerned with a controversy between Fundamentalists, mainly American. It bears the sub-title: 'An Examination of the claim of Dispensationalists that the Christian Church is a mystery parenthesis which interrupts the fulfilment to Israel of the Kingdom prophecies of the Old Testament.' Dispensationalism, for which the 'Scofield Reference Bible' is 'practically a text-book,' can be traced back to the Plymouth Brethren movement of the early nineteenth century. According to it, the Old Testament prophecies relating to Israel were not consummated in the Christian Church; they are to be literally fulfilled. The presence of the Church in the world is a hindrance to the fulfilment of God's promises concerning Israel. The Church, therefore, will be 'raptured,' and this rapture may take place 'at any time.' The salvation of Israel and of 'the enormous majority of mankind' will follow the removal of the Church. It is easy to see that in the present state of the Jewish question these ideas would have important political consequences if they became widely accepted. Dr. Allis has no difficulty in proving—at least to the satisfaction of the unprejudiced—that 'the writings of the Dispensationalists furnish many examples of hair-splitting distinctions and of arbitrary assertions which have little if any basis in fact or rest upon a partial and inadequate induction of the available facts.' The text which he quotes on his title-page is really sufficient to settle his controversy with the Dispensationalists: 'Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days' (Ac 3²⁴).

New Testament Prophecy, by the Rev. H. A. Guy, B.A., B.D. (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d. net), is a learned and comprehensive review of the material which presents the work of John the Baptist and Jesus and early Christian leaders as prophetic, and the publishers are to be congratulated on its fine production. The author seeks to establish the existence of a special movement or impulse in religion that is to be designated prophetism, and to use this conception as a clue to interpretation. But the attempt to give a precise definition to prophetism has to proceed by using all the material for the proper evaluation of which the resulting definition is afterwards offered as a criterion; and so the argument seems a little like first winding and then unwinding the same ball of thread.

While it is therefore doubtful whether the author arrives at any new or commanding view-point there are valuable and suggestive comments. Jesus' saying in Mt 11²⁷—'No man knoweth the Father . . .—is shown to be closely in line with the self-consciousness of Old Testament prophets. The notion that any reference to mystery religions should be looked for in Jesus' phrase, 'the mystery of the kingdom of God' (Mk 4¹¹) is rebutted by insisting that it is prophetic rather than didactic in tone. And the fact that the mystic element in the Fourth Gospel is unlike anything in Old Testament prophecy is regarded as an argument for referring it to the writer of the Gospel rather than to Jesus.

The value of this scholarly and painstaking investigation would have been enhanced by a more vigorous summary of whatever operative conclusions it reaches.

Prophetic Prayer, by the Rev. H. Trevor Hughes, M.A., Vice-Principal of Westminster Training College (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), is 'A History of the Christian Doctrine of Prayer to the Reformation.' There are many books on the meaning and methods of prayer, but this is something different. It is an attempt to trace from earliest times the attitude of different people within the Church to various aspects of prayer. Curiously enough, Mr. Hughes has received the impression (partly from his work as chaplain to the Forces) that, for many (indeed 'the vast majority') of the people inside as well as outside the Church, prayer has little relevance to ordinary life. And he has written this book under the deep conviction that all life should be linked to God. The whole of life should be regarded as lived in the eye of God and as a consecration to Him. And he has tested this conviction in the various ages of faith. His subjects are Prayer in the Old Testament, in the New Testament, in the Early Church, in Monasticism, in the Eastern Church, in Augustine and Thomas Aquinas and the Reformers. This is an interesting line, and Mr. Hughes has carried out his aim with faithfulness and genuine scholarship.

The New Bible Handbook, edited by the Rev. G. T. Manley, M.A., assisted by the Rev. G. C. Robinson, B.A., B.D., and the Rev. A. M. Stibbs,

M.A. (Inter-Varsity Fellowship), will no doubt serve a useful purpose for those for whom it is intended, but it is too full of prejudice against 'rationalistic' criticism to have a wider appeal. Its standpoint, especially in the sections dealing with the Old Testament, is that of an unyielding fundamentalism. It is true that many of the earlier critics were rationalistic in their presuppositions, and that the Wellhausen pattern of Old Testament history was too much in bondage to the nineteenth-century theory of evolutionary progress. But to define the issue as one between belief in miracles, and disbelief in them, is to over-simplify it, especially when we are asked to take the stories of Balaam's ass and Jonah as literal history. In order to maintain their positions, the writers in the *Handbook* are reduced to much faulty logic, as when it is said that because in both the Old and New Testaments the figure of the bridegroom-bride relationship between God and man is used, 'We therefore cannot but apply this book'—the Song of Solomon (it was written by Solomon)—'in a similar sense.' The chapters on the New Testament are much more fairly written than those on the Old; for example, sympathetic treatment is given to the Synoptic problem and even to form-criticism, and it is not claimed that Matthew wrote any more of the First Gospel than those sections which are taken from Q.

The second issue of *Youth Organizations of Great Britain* (Jordan and Sons; 8s. 6d. net) has appeared, under the general editorship of Mr. Douglas Cooke, M.C., M.A. It contains accounts of all the youth bodies in the kingdom, and all factual information has been brought up to date. A number of articles are also included dealing with youth activities of evening institutes, youth and radio, and the training for youth leadership. It also contains a summary of the facilities available throughout the country for training at universities and university colleges. Whatever information you may want about organized youth interests will be found here, and if your organization is not mentioned, the publishers invite you to send them information which will be included in a later issue.

The Story of Israel Throughout the Bible, by W. W. Lucas, M.A., LL.M. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 8s. 6d. net), is written fluently by one who believes in what he describes as 'the plenary inspiration' of the Bible. It includes an odd 'addendum' in which the author, intrigued by the complications of Jacob's marital experiences, plumps for Leah as a true spiritual heroine and finds a token of Jacob's compunction for his treatment of her and a Divine recompense in the fact that she was buried beside Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, and Rebecca!

What really amounts to the application of a sound teaching method to discussions by a group is the basis of a series of books with the title *Unto a Full-Grown Man*, five volumes of which have already been published. The sixth volume has just appeared under the title *The Word of*

God, by the Rev. E. R. Wickham (S.P.C.K. ; 3s. net). The 'method' in this case is a process under four heads: Prepare (7 minutes), Picture (10 minutes), Ponder (20 minutes to a maximum of an hour), and Pray and Promise (10 minutes). Careful directions are given under each head so that any group of young people (or adults) can use the method without confusion. There are seven chapters in this volume dealing with The Word of God, God in History, The Religion of the Bible, and cognate topics. In each chapter the subject is expounded according to the plan indicated above, so that the whole method is illustrated in detail and the subject is 'cut and dried.'

'*The Volume of the Book*' (Psalm 40⁷), by W. L. Thompson (Stockwell ; 7s. 6d. net), is one of those tantalizing titles which give no indication of an author's intention. The book appears to be a collection of imaginary conversations between Adam and Eve, Joseph and Levi, Phineas and Caleb, and Solomon and the Queen of Sheba. The author in his Foreword declares that the experiences rehearsed by the participants were so thrilling to him 'that he often forgot all else, returning to earth only when physical needs pressed so hard that they had to be attended to.' It is hard to imagine Solomon saying to the Queen of Sheba: 'Consciousness without life is one of those absurdities which exist in the human mind only: then only so long as the *individual human* is ignorant of the real issues of Life.' For those who enjoy reading unintelligible nonsense this book is the last word.

There is evidence on all sides of a growing interest in Old Testament theology as distinct from the history of Old Testament religion. The latest writer to voice this conviction is an American, Professor G. Ernest Wright of McCormick Theological Seminary, in a little volume entitled *The Challenge of Israel's Faith* (S.C.M. ; 6s. net). His plea is that 'historicism' is not enough. The tendency for any student of a historical and progressive revelation is to assume that, when he has examined a truth in its historical setting, his task is finished. Dr. Wright insists that it has scarcely begun. As he sees it, the historian dwells in the past, while the theologian constructs his theology on philosophical principles, and sees in the Bible, especially in the Old Testament, little more than illustrations of his theses, which he may take or leave as he pleases. Not that texts are to be regulative for doctrine simply because they are in the Bible; but, urges Dr. Wright, if only we would humble ourselves, and let the prophets speak to us, we should find their message as relevant to our contemporary situation as it was when they first uttered it. Surely he is right. The Old Testament is of much more than antiquarian interest; the primary articles of Israel's faith are fundamental to modern Christian thought and life. This book is as challenging as its title intends it to be.

The discovery of the Lachish ostraka in 1935 was at once recognized as perhaps the most important ever made in the field of Palestinian archaeology. First enthusiasms saw in the ostraka a detailed confirmation of the story of the fugitive prophet Uriah in Jer 26²⁰⁻²³. By others 'the prophet' who is mentioned in the documents was thought to be no less a person than Jeremiah himself. '*The Prophet in the Lachish Ostraca*, by Professor D. Winton Thomas, M.A. (Tyndale Press ; 2s. 6d. net), will come as a cold douche to many. But it is an entirely salutary one. Professor Thomas shows that there is only one passage in the ostraka which indubitably mentions a prophet, and a dispassionate examination has convinced him that 'our only safe conclusion is that we have to do here with a prophet whose name we do not know any more than we know the names of the numerous anonymous prophets who meet us in the Old Testament.' The cardinal error, he thinks, in the theories that would identify 'the prophet' with a known individual, is the assumption that all the ostraka belong to an interrelated group, originating from one and the same sender, and dealing with one and the same theme. Does his 'sober caution' lessen the value of the ostraka? By no means. They teach us much about Hebrew writing, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary (including proper names), in the time of Jeremiah. But if their contacts with the Bible are indirect, not direct, they are none the less valuable. That is true of nearly all archaeological discoveries, when once first enthusiasms have been corrected.

It is now more than fifty years since the Belgian scholar, Van Hoonacker, first suggested that Nehemiah preceded Ezra. In the meantime this view has come to be generally accepted in England and America, though German scholars have been less enthusiastic about it. The issue is not a partisan one, and a substitution of Artaxerxes II. for Artaxerxes I. in the story of Ezra, so making the date of Ezra's mission 397 B.C. instead of 456, has always seemed too simple a piece of surgery to effect a final solution of the problem. The Rev. J. Stafford Wright, M.A., Senior Tutor at Oak Hill Theological College, in *The Date of Ezra's Coming to Jerusalem* (Tyndale Press ; 2s. 6d. net), makes a strong plea for keeping to the traditional Biblical order Ezra-Nehemiah. It has generally been assumed that the Chronicler reversed the historical order Nehemiah-Ezra in order to magnify the priest-scribe at the expense of the layman. This is not exactly obvious from his story, and Mr. Wright thinks that historical memory was not so short as the modern theory requires us to assume. He believes that the difficulties that have led to the modern theory of the priority of Nehemiah can be satisfactorily explained, and he adduces, from the Bible narrative, some positive details in favour of the traditional order. It is safe to say that this short but important pamphlet will have to be seriously reckoned with by all who write on the subject henceforth.

Matthew and Paul.¹

By C. H. DODD, D.D., NORRIS-HULSE PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

'MATTHEW,' says Papias, 'composed the Logia in the Hebrew language.' Some moderns have surmised that he is alluding to a document now lost, which may have served as a source to the First Evangelist. The ancient Church did not so understand him. 'Matthew,' says Irenæus, 'among the Hebrews, in their own language, brought out a written Gospel (γραφὴν εὐαγγελίου).' From that time it has been a fixed point in the tradition that our First Gospel in comparison with the others has in some special sense a Jewish character. As a rough generalization it will serve, though not without qualifications which I need not detail. It is at least apparent that those scholars who in recent years have so greatly enriched our understanding of the Jewish background of the Gospels generally find this Gospel exceptionally apt to their purpose. Modern critics, who recognize diverse sources behind our canonical Matthew, have pointed out that in certain portions of the Gospel we seem to find a more emphatic Jewish colouring than in others; and not only a Jewish colouring, but even a certain anti-Gentile bias, and along with it an antagonism to Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles.

This anti-Pauline bias, if such it is, is not to be equally recognized in all parts of the Gospel. The judgment of the old Tübingen school provides a formula which accounts for many of the facts: that the Gospel according to Matthew represents a first approach from the Jewish-Christian side to the Catholicism which was to provide the Hegelian synthesis between the primitive Judaic Christianity in which that Gospel is rooted and the Gentile Christianity of Paul. In any case, the presumed sources of this Gospel and the process of its composition, so far as criticism is able to reconstruct it, would seem to belong to a *milieu* remote from that of Paul. It is, indeed, rarely plausible to infer any considerable degree of direct Pauline influence in any of the Gospels, but in Matthew traces of such influence are indeed difficult to find; and that Paul had read Matthew is plainly impossible. We may be tolerably sure that we have before us two writers independent of one another.

It is therefore of all the more interest to compare the treatment of certain Christian themes by these two writers, who in immediate background, angle of approach, and turn of mind appear to have so

little in common. It is to such a comparison that I now turn.

I. I propose to start with the eschatological framework of the Christian Gospel, which in its main lines is common to all parts of the New Testament. It has often been observed that the Epistles of Paul show a progressive diminution of interest in eschatology, while Matthew appears to have a place in a series which shows an ascending curve of interest. So far the two writers would seem to represent opposed tendencies. It has not, however, been so often observed that in one respect the two show a rather striking agreement. They both assign a special place in the eschatological scheme to the Kingdom of Christ, as in some sense distinct from the Kingdom of God.

Paul has left us a brief sketch of the eschatological sequence in 1 Co 15. There are three cardinal points: the Resurrection of Christ, His Advent, and τὸ τέλος. So he says, succinctly, in vv. 23-24. The τέλος, he adds, is the point at which Christ surrenders the βασιλεία to God the Father. He then explains that according to Scripture Christ must continue to reign (δεῖ βασιλεῦειν) until He has put all His enemies beneath His feet, including the last enemy, Death. When this final conquest is complete, 'then the Son also will be subjected to Him who subjected all else to Him, that God may be all in all.' Such, we may take it, is the Kingdom of God in its final consummation. The Kingdom of Christ is in some sort a stage towards that consummation. At which point His reign is held to begin is not quite clear. It is certainly in being between the παρουσία and the τέλος. It is not however stated that it begins at the παρουσία. It may be legitimate to adduce here a passage in Colossians—I¹²⁻¹⁴. Here we are told that God the Father 'has made us capable of a share in the inheritance of the saints in light'—the inheritance being still future, but the act by which we are made capable of it already past (for the verb is aorist). In other words, He 'rescued us out of the dominion of darkness and transferred us into the Kingdom of the Son of His love, in whom we already enjoy the liberation which is the forgiveness of sins.' This seems clear enough. The divine act of redemption by which our sins are forgiven has already admitted us to the Kingdom of Christ, while it has also rendered us capable of entering hereafter into the eternal light which is the Kingdom of God in its fullness, which,

¹ A paper communicated to the Cambridge Theological Society, 20th February, 1947.

as we are told in 1 Co 15⁵⁰, flesh and blood cannot inherit. It seems therefore that we are to think of the Kingdom of Christ as inaugurated by His Resurrection; to be manifested at His Advent; and finally to pass into the consummated Kingdom of God.

The Gospel according to Matthew twice speaks of the Kingdom of Christ in Marcan contexts where Mark does not give the expression (16²⁸ 20²¹). But the two passages which are significant for our present purpose are peculiar to Matthew: the interpretation of the Parable of the Tares in 13³⁷⁻⁴³, and the Judgment Scene of 25³¹⁻⁴⁶. In the former passage we read that at the *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* 'the Son of Man will send His angels, and they will gather out of His Kingdom all scandals and those who act lawlessly, and cast them' (to resume the imagery of the Parable) 'into the furnace of fire. Then the righteous will shine like the sun in the Kingdom of their Father.' In this climax we recognize once again the Kingdom of God in its consummation—'the inheritance of the saints in light,' according to Col 1¹². Before the righteous enter unto this final state, there has been a prior stage which is called here, as by Paul, the Kingdom of Christ—more precisely, of the Son of Man. This Kingdom still contains righteous and unrighteous indistinguishably. It is the final Judgment which ends this provisional state, and leads to the consummation.

In 25³¹⁻⁴⁶ this Judgment is depicted in a dramatic scene. The Son of Man comes in glory attended by angels, and takes His throne. All nations are gathered before Him for judgment. As King, He pronounces sentence. The selfish and callous are dismissed to the eternal fire. To those who have served the King in the person of His 'brethren' He says, 'Come, blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world'; and thereupon they enter into eternal life. It is not here said that the kingdom they inherit (=eternal life) is the Kingdom of God, but we need hardly hesitate to make the identification. Those for whom the Kingdom has been prepared are the *υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας* of 13³⁸.

The parallel with Paul is close. For Matthew, as for Paul, the Kingdom of Christ exists in this world during historical time, under our familiar conditions with their confused mixture of evil and good. At what point, then, are we to suppose that Christ's reign begins? It is at the Advent, according to 25³¹, that He takes His throne, and the expressions, 'in his kingdom,' 'in thy kingdom,' in 16²⁸ and 20²¹, clearly refer to the same Advent. Yet in the closing verses of the Gospel the Risen Christ affirms that He is already invested with *ἐξουσία*; by virtue of that authority

He commissions His apostles to promulgate His commandments among all nations; and at the same time He promises that He will be with them during the period still to elapse before the *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*—which for Matthew is synchronous with the *παρουσία*. This Matthaean Christophany, in fact, as Professor Lightfoot has pointed out, is a kind of proleptic *παρουσία*, in sharp contrast to the Christophanies of Luke. The Resurrection is for Matthew the moment at which Christ is invested with His Messianic kingship, and the promise of His continued presence with His followers indicates that they (His 'brethren') form the community within which that kingship is effectively exercised. This is very close to the Pauline view. Both again agree that at Christ's advent His kingship will become effective over all mankind, in a final judgment to which, according to Matthew, 'all nations' are exposed; cf. Ro 2¹²⁻¹⁶.

It is tempting to say, the Kingdom of Christ is the Church; but the simple equation of the two is perhaps not justified. In Matthew the field in which wheat and tares grow together is the world where righteous and unrighteous are mingled until the King whose subjects they all are separates them; and in the Judgment Scene we learn that over and above the 'brethren' of the King—who are, in the first intention at least, members of the Church—there are many others who never knew Christ, and yet are, in the language of ch. 13, *υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας*. Similarly, in Ro 1¹²⁻¹⁶, on the day when God judges men through Christ, there will be Gentiles who knew not the Law, but did by nature the things of the Law, and who summon their consciences to witness before the throne. Are not they, we may ask, in some sense subjects of the Kingdom of Christ? In neither case is it quite clear that we may absolutely identify the Kingdom of Christ with the Church, though the relation between the two concepts is very intimate.

II. This leads to a consideration of passages which deal directly with the Church. Matthew, alone of the Evangelists, uses the term *ἐκκλησία*. He uses it in the two senses which have been distinguished in Paul. In Mt 18¹⁷ *ἡ ἐκκλησία* means, *prima facie*, a local congregation; in Mt 16¹⁸ *ἡ ἐκκλησία μου* is the Catholic Church, the new Israel. It may, however, be usefully recalled that there was at one time a local congregation which was also the whole congregation of Christian people in the world—the Church of Jerusalem. It appears (if we may follow the Acts) that the use of the term *ἡ ἐκκλησία*, absolutely, for the Church of Jerusalem survived long after it had ceased to correspond with the facts (for example, Ac 18²²). Christians elsewhere in Judaea, and later in Galilee and Samaria (Ac 8¹ 9³¹), were

recorded as non-resident members of ἡ ἐκκλησία, to wit, the Church of Jerusalem (while Paul spoke of αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Ἰουδαίας [Gal 1²²]). It may be, then, that we should read Mt 18¹⁷, which ostensibly refers to a local congregation, with the idea of the Catholic Church, or the new Israel, as an unexpressed extension of meaning. I believe that the passage as a whole, 18¹⁵⁻²⁰, which is a kind of rudimentary 'Church Order,' demands such an extension.

It is, at any rate, here that we must start our comparison with Paul, for in view of the relations known to have existed between Peter and Paul, we shall hardly expect the epistles of the latter Apostle to contain any echo of the statements of Mt 16^{18, 19} that Peter holds the keys, and that he is the rock upon which the Church is founded. If Ephesians is Pauline, then Paul is prepared to speak of the apostolic body as a whole, together with the prophets, as the foundation of the Church (Eph 2²⁰); but elsewhere Christ is the Church's one foundation (1 Co 3¹¹); Peter and the others are pillars in the Temple, no more (Gal 2⁹; cf. Rev 3¹²).

If we turn, then, to 18¹⁵⁻²⁰ we find the ἐκκλησία depicted in the concrete as an organized society with its prescribed methods of discipline. If one member offends, the offended person is to strive for reconciliation, first individually, and if that fails, with the support of one or two others. In the last resort he must refer the matter to the ἐκκλησία. If the offender is still contumacious, he is to be treated as excommunicate—ὥσπερ ὁ ἐθνικός καὶ ὁ τελώνης, a form of expression which certainly betrays a Jewish milieu.

Whatever be the original *Sitz im Leben* of these directions, we observe that Paul recommends substantially the same procedure. 'If a brother be overtaken in a fault, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness' (Gal 6¹). This is no more than a paraphrase of Mt 18¹⁵. To act so, Paul adds, bearing one another's burdens, is to fulfil the 'law of Christ' (Gal 6²). If the effort is successful, according to Matthew, ἐκέρδηςας τὸν ἀδελφόν. Κερδαίνειν in this sense is best illustrated by 1 Co 9¹⁹⁻²². It is found also in 1 P 3¹, and may be regarded as a quasi-technical term of early Christianity.

Where the attempt at reconciliation fails, recourse must be had, Paul enjoins, to the Church courts. In no case must a Christian cite a brother Christian before the secular courts (1 Co 6¹⁻⁸). In the long drawn out case of the Corinthian offender (or offenders) we can see the procedure at work. The offender is to be excommunicated by vote of the ἐκκλησία (1 Co 5¹⁻¹³). Apparently, however, this drastic step brought him to his senses, and in the upshot the offending brother was 'gained'

(2 Co 2⁵⁻¹¹ 7¹⁰⁻¹³). The whole episode shows the Matthaean regulations, certainly Jewish-Christian in form, at work in Paul's Gentile Christian churches.

To these disciplinary regulations Matthew has added a saying which empowers the Apostles to 'bind and loose,' that is, to declare and enforce the laws of the Christian community. By implication, we must surely understand that the disciplinary action contemplated in the previous verses is to be carried out under apostolic authority. For Paul the question of apostolic authority is a delicate one, in view of his equivocal position *vis-à-vis* the Twelve. Dr. Knox (*St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, 363 ff.) has shown that Paul's claim to be recognized as an Apostle *in the same sense* as Peter and the rest of the Twelve was far from strong—no one, of course wished to deny him a place in the wider Apostolic circle, with Barnabas, Andronicus and Junia and others—and that he was uncomfortably aware of it. We may perhaps discern a certain discomfort in his references to οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι, οἱ δοκοῦντες; and the like (2 Co 11⁶ 12¹¹, Gal 2¹⁻¹⁰). Yet he had no wish to impugn apostolic authority in itself. His position was that he had received from Christ a commission as direct and as plenary as that of the Twelve, and that he possessed an authority equal to theirs to 'bind and loose' in the name of Christ. 'I am writing,' he says, 'in my absence, in order that I may not have to come and deal summarily according to the authority which the Lord gave me' (2 Co 13¹⁰). This authority he exercised, for example, in legislating for the conduct of Church assemblies in 1 Co 14: 'If any one,' he adds, (v. 37) 'claims to be a prophet or inspired person, let him recognize that what I write is of the Lord.¹ If he does not recognize it, he is not recognized.' Similarly in the Corinthian case of discipline, while the matter is adjudged by the ἐκκλησία, the sentence of excommunication is passed under Paul's apostolic authority: 'I have already decided,' he writes (ἤδη κέκρικα), 'as if I were present, you and my own spirit being assembled in the name of the Lord Jesus, to hand over the offender to Satan' (1 Co 5³⁻⁵).

Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ συναχθέντων ὑμῶν: the expression recurs in the Matthaean passage, to which we now return. 'Where two or three are assembled in My name (συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἔμὸν ὄνομα), there am I in their midst.' This may be understood to state the reason why, whether in the Jewish Christian community to which Mt 18¹⁵⁻²⁰ is addressed, or in the Gentile Church of Corinth, the assembly of believers has the right to pass judgment on its own members: it is because

¹ ὅτι κυρίου ἐστίν: the ἐντολή, or ἐντολαί, of some MSS. is perhaps an interpolation.

Christ is among them since they are assembled in His name. But the saying in Matthew has also a larger reference. Its form cannot but recall the well-known maxim of *Pirge Aboth*: 'When two sit and there are between them words of Torah, the Shekinah rests between them' (*Pirge Aboth*, iii. 3). It is difficult not to think that there is a connexion between the two sayings. Although *Pirge Aboth*, iii. 3 is attributed to R. Hanina ben Teradion, who was among the victims of the repression of Bar-Cochba's revolt, A.D. 135, and is therefore later than the First Gospel, yet any dependence of the Jewish saying upon the Christian is unlikely.¹ If we may assume that the idea expressed in Hanina's maxim underlies the Gospel saying, there is a twofold substitution: for the Torah as the link between two faithful Jews is substituted the name of Jesus as the principle of unity between two Christians; and for the Shekinah—the divine Presence—is substituted Christ Himself in the midst of His people. This passage, therefore, which appears to set out to give nothing more than a kind of rudimentary Church-order, leads to a profound conception of what constitutes the *ἐκκλησία*: it is the body in which Christ dwells.

This interpretation is confirmed by the observation that a reiterated affirmation of Christ's presence in the Church forms the close and the climax of the whole Gospel (28²⁰). After the proclamation of the Kingdom of Christ ('All authority is given to Me') the Apostles are commissioned to promulgate the Law of Christ among all nations—i.e., the commission to 'bind and loose' is given oecumenical scope—and the Gospel ends with the words, 'I am with you perpetually until the consummation of the age.' I should hazard the conjecture that the Evangelist may have written up this conclusion on the basis of the material he had given from an earlier source in ch. 18. However that may be, the Church is clearly conceived as the *locus* of the presence of Christ on earth during the interval between His resurrection and *παρουσία*.

The full significance of this is to be appreciated only when we observe that the Gospel opens with the prophecy of 'Emmanuel, God with us,' just as it closes with the promise of Christ with us. In the view of this Evangelist, the whole Gospel story is the story of how the presence of God came to men, first in the earthly ministry of Jesus, and

then, through His resurrection, in the Church in which He dwells perpetually until the *συντέλεια*. The meaning of the saying in Mt 18²⁰ becomes clearer when it is read in this context, although even by itself it implies clearly enough that the presence of Christ with His people is equivalent to the Shekinah.

Such is the high Matthaean doctrine of the Church. Its affinity with Paul's doctrine is manifest, even though the forms of expression are widely different. For Paul, the Church is the Body of Christ, in which He dwells by His Spirit. The Spirit of Christ, replacing the *γράμμα* of the Torah (2 Co 3), provides the norm of life within the *ἐκκλησία*; and as being also the Spirit of God, is the fulfilment of the prophetic promise which Matthew, though not Paul, expresses in the word Emmanuel. Within the Body of Christ, the individual member of the Church is in such sort identified with Christ that he can say *Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι*, *ὡς δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός* (Gal 2¹⁹), and, again, *ἀνταπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (Col 1²⁴). Similarly in Mt 25^{40, 45} Christ says 'Inasmuch as ye did it (did it not) to the least of these My brethren, ye did it (did it not) to Me.' We may recall that Dr. Albert Schweitzer found here the link between the historic teaching of Jesus and the Pauline 'Christ-mysticism.' At his conversion Paul heard the Lord saying, 'I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting' (Ac 9⁵ 22⁸ 26¹⁵)—in other words, 'Inasmuch as you persecute My brethren, you do it to Me.' The idea of the solidarity of believers with the Lord is present in Paul's conversion experience, and the doctrine of the Body of Christ follows from it; but that idea is already given in the sayings of Jesus as they appear in the Gospel according to Matthew.

III. In the Pauline Epistles and the First Gospel alike, the Christian position is stated in part by way of a polemical criticism of certain aspects of contemporary Judaism. Such criticism is to be found chiefly in the anti-Pharisaic discourse of Mt 23 and in the anti-Jewish diatribe of Ro 2, though other passages in both authors may usefully be compared.

The Matthaean anti-Pharisaic discourse begins in a way which recalls curiously the opening of the Mishnic tractate *Pirge Aboth*. The latter begins: 'Moses received the Torah from Sinai and delivered it to Joshua, and Joshua to the Elders, and the Elders to the Prophets, and the Prophets delivered it to the men of the Great Synagogue.' From them the succession of teachers is traced through various Rabbis to Hillel and Shammai, Gamaliel, and others, and so to Judah the Prince, the chief compiler of the Mishna. The intention is to assign to contemporary Rabbis the

¹ In the discussion which followed the reading of this paper Dr. David Daube observed that Hanina's maxim should be understood as meeting the peculiarly difficult situation during the Hadrianic persecution, when the Rabbinical schools were suppressed, and regular ordinations to the Rabbinate could not be carried on. He held, however, that Hanina was only re-stating a principle anciently accepted.

authority which is derived by a valid succession from Moses. Similarly the Matthaean discourse begins: 'The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore that they command you, do and keep.' This introduction conclusively points to a Jewish *milieu* (whether it be the Judaism of the time of Jesus or a Jewish-Christian community). It is only after this entirely orthodox introduction that, by a kind of *paraprosochian*, the discourse turns to denunciation of these successors of Moses.

To speak broadly, six main charges are brought against them, which we may enumerate as follows:

- (1) Their conduct is inconsistent with their teaching.
- (2) They lay burdens on others which they do not bear themselves.
- (3) They glorify themselves as teachers.
- (4) They refuse to enter the Kingdom of God and prevent others from entering.
- (5) They care for the outward and neglect the inward.
- (6) They repeat the murder of the prophets, while professing to honour them.

The Pauline passage is different in form and manner. Its style is that of the Hellenistic *diatribē*, with its pointed apostrophes and its free use of the rhetorical question. In substance, however, the charges which Paul brings against the Jews in general are similar to those to which the scribes and Pharisees are exposed in Matthew.

The charges numbered 1, 2, 3, and 5 are represented by fairly close parallels in Romans.

(1) Paul charges the Jews whom he has in mind with claiming to know the will of God, to possess the formula of knowledge and truth in the Torah, and to teach its precepts, while acting contrary to them (Ro 2¹⁷⁻²³). Not the hearers of the Law, he reminds them, but the doers are justified before God (Ro 2¹³; cf. Mt 7¹⁵⁻²¹).

(2) They pronounce judgment on others, while evading it themselves. The wording of Ro 2¹⁻³ echoes Mt 7^{1ff.}, while the development of the charge at length in vv. 21-23 is similar in substance to Matthew's charge of laying on others *φορτία* which they refuse to touch themselves (23⁴). In Gal 6²⁻⁵, on the contrary, the Law of Christ (by implication) demands that every man shall bear his own *φορτίον*.

(3) As in Mt 23⁵⁻¹⁰ the Scribes pride themselves on the title Rabbi (or in Greek *καθηγητής*), so the Jew who is the butt of Paul's attack (Ro 2^{19, 20}) professes to be *ὁδηγὸς τυφλῶν* (cf. Mt 15¹⁴ 23¹⁶), *φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει* (cf. Mt 5¹⁴⁻¹⁶) *παιδευτῆς ἀφρόνων*, *διδάσκαλος νηπίων*.

(5) The charge of caring for externals at the expense of the inward life (Mt 23²⁵⁻²⁸) has its parallel in Ro 2^{28, 29}, where *ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖος*

is contrasted with *ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος*. For the terms used, cf. Mt 6¹⁶⁻¹⁸, where the cognate verb *φανῆναι* and adjective *κρυφαῖος* convey the same meanings.

For the other two charges, those of preventing men from entering the Kingdom of God and of being accessory to the murder of the prophets, we must turn to 1 Th 2^{15, 16}, where the Jews are charged with killing the Lord Jesus and the prophets and with preventing the preaching of salvation to the Gentiles. As in Matthew the accumulated guilt of the murder of the righteous in all ages rests upon this generation (23³⁴⁻³⁶), so Paul declares that the Jews have now completed the tale of their sins (*ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας*), and the wrath has come upon them finally (*εἰς τέλος*). Without any verbal resemblance, the inner affinity of the two passages is close.

It appears that behind Paul's polemic there lies a tradition of anti-Judaic, or anti-Pharisaic, propaganda very similar in general purport to that which we find in Matthew. What is particularly remarkable is that both Mt 23 and Ro 2 have the character of criticism of Judaism from a standpoint within Judaism, rather than an attack from without. None of the charges, whether in Matthew or in Paul, presupposes distinctively Christian principles or standards: all of them might have been brought against Jews by a Jew who believed that his nation and his faith were being put to shame by unworthy representatives of them.

IV. To sum up: comparison of certain passages in the First Gospel and in the Pauline Epistles reveals significant agreements between them in eschatological teaching, in the idea of the Church and Church-order, and in the controversy with Pharisaic Judaism. There is nothing to suggest either literary dependence or derivation from a common source; but it would appear that behind both writers there lies some kind of common tradition. It is a tradition notably Jewish-Christian in character, whether we meet it in Matthew or in Paul. We are apt to forget that the Apostle to the Gentiles was himself a Jewish Christian. He was, in fact, precisely what Matthew describes in 13⁵², a Rabbi converted¹ to the Christian religion. Of his early career as a Christian we know singularly little. For several years after his conversion, he tells us, he was unknown by face to the churches of Judæa (Gal 1²²). That is not to say that he was out of touch with the synagogue or with Christians of Jewish origin.

¹ *Μαθητευθεὶς* is in the Peshitta *mettalmad*: *talmēd* is in Syriac writers the technical term for to 'convert' a person to a faith, a philosophy, or a way of life. *Μαθητεῖν* is similarly used in Mt 28²⁰: we may fairly conjecture that it represents the expression used in the early Aramaic-speaking Church.

Among his friends, Andronicus and Junia at least were Jews converted to Christianity before Paul himself (Ro 16⁷). Moreover in his sketch of an autobiography in 2 Co 11 he tells us that he was five times beaten by the Jews. He must at that time have been subject to synagogal discipline. It is probable that a great part of his twelve years' ministry (or so) in the κλίματα of Syria and Cilicia (Gal 1²¹) was exercised within the framework of the synagogue. There is no need for the doubts which have been expressed about the statement of Acts that even after the opening of his Gentile mission from Antioch he still started whenever possible in the synagogue. The diatribe of Ro 2 might well be a product of his early years

when the Jewish colouring of the environment in which he worked was still pronounced.

It appears, therefore, that we are being led back to a very early stage in the formation of the Christian tradition, before any marked divergence between the ideas of Jewish and Gentile Christianity had developed. The material we have examined has the character of διδαχή as distinct from κήρυγμα. Both traditional forms, the 'didactic' and the 'kerygmatic,' certainly go back to the earliest times. It may be that we have been tracing one more way of approach to that central and primitive tradition in which we must seek a firm base for the exploration of the life and teaching of Jesus.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Queen's Smile.

BY THE REVEREND C. THORPE, GATOOMA, SOUTH RHODESIA.

'Who loved me, and gave himself up for me.'—Gal 2²⁰ (R.V.).

WHEN the Royal Family visited Rhodesia recently they arrived from Pretoria by air. What a welcome they were given! They will never forget their visit to Victoria Falls, where the River Zambesi—over a mile wide—plunges over a precipice between three and four hundred feet high. They will never forget the solemn beauty of World's View in the Matopos, where Cecil John Rhodes lies buried. The two Princesses will always cherish the gifts they received, and particularly the two pieces of virgin gold, still embedded in its native quartz, that were presented to them at Gatooma. But what of our memories of them?

There are hundreds of people—pioneers, ex-servicemen, and others—who were formally presented to them; but the King and Queen made a point of talking informally to a great many more. Some of the people to whom they spoke were so overcome that they could hardly get a word out in reply, but in most cases the Queen's smile soon put them at their ease.

The Queen's smile! That is what everybody still talks about, what they will remember to their dying day. There was a cartoon in a Rhodesian newspaper that summed up everybody's thoughts about the visit. In the drawing two aeroplanes (the ones carrying the Royal guests) are seen disappearing in the distance, and two big birds are flying round in the foreground, an expression of delight on both their faces. One says to the other, 'Goodness! Did you see that? She smiled straight at me!'

Talking to people after the King and Queen had

gone, that was what you heard. Every second person was sure that the Queen had smiled at them *personally*. 'She smiled straight at ME!' And that lovely smile from our gracious Queen did more than anyone can ever say to bring goodwill to the peoples of South Africa. It was personal. It was sincere. It was meant for them.

Sometimes when we listen to sermons we smile to ourselves and say, 'I do hope that Mr. So-and-So in the next pew but one is listening. What the preacher is saying exactly describes the sort of thing he is always doing.' Or, 'I daren't turn round, but I'm sure Mrs. Whatsit is blushing now. She's for ever saying the sort of mean thing that the minister is describing.' And we never stop to think that we ourselves should take the message to heart.

In English business offices we read on the doors—PRIVATE. NO ADMITTANCE EXCEPT ON BUSINESS. In America they are not so polite. (Or, shall we say, they are more direct.) They put KEEP OUT. THIS MEANS 'YOU.'

When we read our Bibles we sometimes find sayings of Christ which are stern and severe. 'If thy right hand causeth thee to stumble, cut it off, and cast it from thee.' 'Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven.' 'Resist not him that is evil.' We read these sayings and very often don't take them seriously.

But there are other parts of the Bible that we don't find it easy to believe—the promises of God, for instance, and of Christ. 'He shall not be afraid of evil tidings: his heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord.' 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' 'I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved.'

Perhaps if you are allowed to mark your Bibles, you might write in the margin, against some of these texts—'This means ME!'

There is a lovely word of the Apostle Paul's,

who was so certain that Jesus, the Heavenly King, as it were smiled straight at him, and that Jesus had given all He could for him personally, that he could write, 'The Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me.'

But it was not only St. Paul whom the Son of God loved. You can, if you wish, write in the margin of your Bible, against this verse, 'This means ME.'

The Bias.

BY THE REVEREND S. GREER, M.A., AYR.

'The good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.'—Ro 7¹⁹.

These summer evenings do you ever watch a company of bowlers on the nice green sward? How smoothly and surely the bowls go on their way, clustering at last round the little white 'jack,' amid cries of encouragement and excitement! It looks so easy. And it's not easy at all. For, inside each bowl—let me tell you a secret—is a little demon. When you send down a perfectly straight bowl (as you think), this little imp draws it to one side, and you don't go where you intend; you go where you never intended. You may find, indeed, that your bowl has gone off and is trying to take part in somebody else's game! The other people, of course, are very kind about it, and quietly send it about its business. Bowlers call that little imp, the bias, and in playing you learn to make allowance for it. You don't aim where you wish to go, but allow for the fact that the bowl travels in a sort of curve, because one side is heavier than the other.

We have all seen that bias in other things and in other people. We talk about people doing something 'wrong,' and that word 'wrong' means something twisted; actually it is the same word as 'wrung'—just as girls wring clothes they have washed, twisting them. Folk often try to do right, but a twist in their nature sends them in directions they wouldn't have chosen if something hadn't been 'wrong.' St. Paul noticed that, and complained, as we all have done, that 'the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.'

Has it ever happened to you? One day you are sent on an errand and told to 'go straight there and back.' But you met somebody and got talking and—oh, there were some new ships in the harbour; where had they come from? And such interesting things in the toy-shops, you must have just a look at them. And that funny little dog, you must stop and talk to it. It was a very round-about journey 'there and back.' Yes, that bias to idleness is in all of us. Some girls and boys have another very nasty bias; they're not always quite truthful. To tell the whole truth would get them into such a row, so they wriggle out of it with a lie. We've all got a twist of some kind—something 'wrong' in us—and find it easier to go wrong than right. So we must keep watch. What is your particular bias? Laziness?—you can't be bothered? Or do you find envious,

grudging thoughts come so much more easily than generous ones? Or is it selfishness that is always grasping at something for ourselves?

Ask God to help you to overcome it. There was a man, once; his name means Twister, Cheat—Jacob. He told, and acted lies in order to get the better of his brother; he deceived his father. Then one night his lies caught up with him. And, we read, 'an angel wrestled with him' till the daybreak. And God twisted that twister straight; untwisted the 'wrong' thing in him. Whatever the bias may be, God will help us to run straight and stand upright if we ask Him for the dear Saviour's sake to make us true and pure and kind as Jesus was. He will even give us a new bias. For, if we love Him, a love of the things He loves will grow so strong in us that we shall find our heart's affections stretching out to them, and all our life will 'lean to virtue's side.'

The Christian Year.

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Man and His Destiny.

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT BROWN, B.A., B.D.,
EAST KILBRIDE.

'What is man, that thou art mindful of him?'—Ps 84.

This psalm begins like a Nature psalm in which the poet contemplates the glory of God in the majesty and expansiveness of His creation. But a deeper note is sounded when the poet turns to think of man and his place in that setting of great distances and amid the richly varied life of earth and sea and sky. In thus contemplating man within the setting of Nature, the poet steps out of his own age into our own, for I suppose there is no question more topical and more urgent than this question of the nature and destiny of man. The future structure of society will depend upon the answer which our generation gives to this question.

'What is man, that thou art mindful of him?' The Hebrew poet is not so much asking a question about man as making a statement, indeed he is saying something fundamental about man—that God is mindful of him, that God 'visits' him.

Any view of man and of man's destiny which denies this fact is not true to man as he is. The psalmist takes up the prophetic faith that at any moment a man might become God-conscious. Like Jacob at Luz or Isaiah in the Temple he can stumble into the place of God, and his life take on a new dimension. That many people contrive to live without such depth and range of being is no argument against its validity. A soprano singer may use her middle registers, and for years they and they alone may appear to be her natural voice, but with training the lower and higher registers of the natural voice can be explored—and what a totally different 'voice' it is. It is now evident that the merely middle register was not the true natural singing voice, that all the time there had been a range of which that voice

was truly heir, but which had remained unguessed at. Is it not thus with man? Is man *man* unless the height and depths within him are explored, and the potential personality realized and made actual?

There is first the political view of man as a political being—in the sense of *polis*, meaning city. According to this view the chief characteristic of man is his capacity for and need of an ordered social life which will safeguard his physical and mental well-being, and to a degree his religious well-being also. Man as a citizen is thought of as the height of manhood. In the second place, there is the economic view of man. This naturally arose when the city ceased to be primarily a fighting unit and became a centre of trade and commerce. Then the merchant citizen took his place alongside the soldier citizen, and with the change from a mainly agricultural economy to a mainly commercial economy, and then later to industrialism proper, the place of man in the economic system and the place of economics in the life of man, became more pronounced. Thus Dr. John Baillie in his study of Christian Civilization maintains 'that the disturbance caused in the social life of Christendom by the Industrial Revolution is quite as potent a cause of the Church's changed situation as the disturbance caused in its intellectual life by the closely connected and roughly coeval movement known as the Enlightenment.'

The extreme form of this conception of man as an economic being is to be found in certain types of Communism which are inevitably materialistic and collectivist. However brilliantly the picture is painted the final upshot is to reduce man to a unit rather than to regard him as an individual. There is, however, a deeper view of man and his destiny, which, because of its genuine insights, is dangerously attractive. This is the cultural view of man. This more refined conception is, of course, a species of humanism. It seeks to preserve certain values which are independent of the political or economic ordering of society and which have hitherto had little or no place in previous views of man's nature. These æsthetic values and artistic activities are recognized as characteristic of man as man. But, as in all humanism, there is no ultimate standard—and at best, death is the end of all things.

Now it is important to realize that Christianity does not deny these views of man, nor does it seek to combine them together, it fuses them into something higher; it lifts them on to a higher plane than that on which they stand either in isolation or combined. In the words of *The Shorter Catechism*, 'Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him for ever.' To men who are spiritually homeless, who have no idea where they are going or where they want to go, this is gospel—literally 'Good news.'

The Church acknowledges the need of man politically—it is *Church*. It is essentially a *community*, but a community which points beyond itself to a perfected community beyond time. Thus to man's nature which cries out for a city

to dwell in, the Faith speaks of a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

To man's nature which is concerned with the material interests of economic ordering, the Faith ministers in a unique fashion by stressing a concern for the physical well-being of man. Indeed the most amazing thing about Jesus is His common-sense and balanced mind. He never treated people as though they were disembodied souls. He cared for men's bodies and their physical need; He taught a charity to the poor, and warned against the dangers of wealth, but most important of all, He introduced the idea of *stewardship* in a new and revolutionary and creative fashion. The Christian conception of stewardship remains the Church's unique contribution to the life of economic man.

To man's nature in its cultural and æsthetic interests, Christianity has added the absolute and governing idea of spiritual value. To the 'this-worldly' valuations of life it has brought the cleansing of the 'other-worldly' values.

These things Christianity has done because it is the religion of the Incarnation. It sets forth the Word made Flesh. It does not regard man and God as inevitably poles apart, but as essentially kin. Man as he is, with fine and daring realism, the Faith regards as 'Fallen Man,' but that is not the Faith's final word about him—in a deeper sense than the psalmist guessed at 'God is mindful of him'—and miracle of miracles, God has visited and redeemed His people. God has acted toward man in Christ Jesus. He has stooped to lift man up—and *God still does*.

In the doctrine of the Holy Spirit the Church sets forth the truth that God is ever present in creation, and in redemption, and in sanctification. The Faith declares that man is made by God, that the warp in man's nature, the evil that distorts the divine in man, is put right by God for man; and that the whole power of God is available for man whereby he can be raised above his present level of moral and spiritual attainment to heights which by his own unaided efforts he could never reach for himself. This Christian doctrine of man is the result of Christian experience. This view of man and his destiny is no idle dream. The saints of the ages differ in outlook and character, but each and all bear the stamp of the Man of Galilee. Wherever and whenever men allow themselves to come under the forgiving and cleansing and inspiring power of God, something of the Man of Galilee is breathed into their lives, and a light that never shone on sea or land shines out from their faces.

One of the first of those heroes who came under the spell of the Crucified, Saul of Tarsus, did not exaggerate when he spoke of the new man in Christ Jesus, and to-day, as yesterday, the gospel is God's open offer to men of that new manhood in which all the many-sided interests of their nature will find full fruition and in which a man can find his peace, his purpose, and know himself to be at home in God.

What is man? Fashioned out of the dust of earth, . . . ? aye, but God has not left him in the

dust. . . . Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Which Picture Do You Want ?

'So richly has God lavished his grace upon us! He has granted us complete insight and understanding of the open secret of his will, showing us how it was the purpose of his design so to order it in the fulness of the ages that all things in heaven and earth alike should be gathered up in Christ.'—Eph 1⁸⁻¹⁰ (Moffatt).

Human life is so torn by disruptive forces that it sometimes looks as if the world were breaking up. In the general tension, old errors have reappeared, ancient heresies, pagan myths, and brutal fallacies have emerged once more, and there are so many views of the right direction to take, so many pictures to look at, that many are bewildered. Is there any reality which will gather up the distracted attention and the scattered energies of man into a unity? The answer of the Apostle is that the centralizing unity which pulls life together is Christ.

One cannot fail to be arrested by the unique experiments of G. O. Chirikov in restoring old icons some years ago, in the National Central Restoration Workshops in Moscow. These icons were small painted panels, done in gold and bright colours, and formerly used as aids to public worship and private devotion. But in the course of centuries they became blackened and obscured by incense smoke in the church, or chimney smoke in the house where they were hung, with the result that they were painted over several times. The great Master of icon painting was Andrey Rüblev in the fifteenth century, but he painted over the work of former artists and later artists painted over his work. The face of the Blessed Virgin hanging in a man's house or in his office might not have brought him much luck; so it was changed to the face of John the Baptist or an Apostle. But G. O. Chirikov has succeeded in taking X-ray photographs of each layer superimposed on the other and, more than that, he has devised a process by which he can transfer each layer of pigment on the icon intact to another panel and present to the public the twelve or so pictures from different hands and different centuries with the inquiry, 'Which picture do you want?' When one examines the variety of work revealed by this marvellous achievement, there is no doubt which picture one would select, as the supremacy of the old Master Rüblev is evident. In the same way, Jesus Christ stands out as the Great Master who eclipses all other claimants to attention, and His pre-eminence should catch the eye and hold the heart as the key to the future.

The Apostle Paul affirmed that Jesus Christ was the master of human destiny, the goal of creation. Christ had such finality that it was God's purpose to gather up in Christ all things in heaven and earth. When St. Paul said that, he was not merely indulging in grandiose speculation, or playing the

oracular doctrinaire, but was speaking from experience of what Christ had been to him.

It was from his own experience of Christ's supremacy that St. Paul ascribed to Christ a vast significance, gave Him a universal setting, and put the picture of the Master in a cosmic frame. Was it too big a frame for the picture of the Saviour to fill? In *The Fate of Homo Sapiens*, H. G. Wells deplores the lack of any World Brain to gather up the technical knowledge and human ecology lying about loose into a harmonized order of scientific humanism, and concludes that for want of this directive unity mankind has staggered past the zenith of its promise, and is now going downhill to extinction. 'There is no creed,' he says, 'no way of living left in the world at all, that really meets the needs of the time.'

But the Apostle gives Christ the central place in the future, and affirms that the fortunes of mankind are not to collapse in chaos and destruction but are to be summed up in Christ. Which picture do you want—H. G. Wells's picture, which is a portrayal of futile secularism, or the Master's picture, which St. Paul put in the vast frame of human destiny? The Christian faith is that the future of mankind is not gathered up in *Homo Sapiens* but in *Jesus Hominum Salvator*. The Apostle describes Jesus Christ as the last word in the fate of man, bigger and deeper than the most obdurate evil. The Divine intention cannot be routed by any crash in human affairs. God is determined that the young Prince of Glory who shed His blood shall win His war against evil, which is a war on a more age-long and cosmic scale than any war we undertake, and that He shall ascend the throne of human hearts and put all things under His feet, and have a name that is above every name.

That is what gives *meaning* to human life, and makes sense of it. Katherine Mansfield wrote in a letter to a friend: 'God is now gone for all of us. Yet we must believe; and not only that—we must carry our weakness, and our sin, and our devilishness to somebody.' She toyed with the idea that love between lovers might take the place of the religious relationship, and then dropped it with the sigh, 'But oh, it is no good!' Here is the wistful picture of a questing spirit which has not come to rest, for the major problem is how to adjust ourselves to the demands of life, and how to deal with our bafflement and sense of need; so it does not satisfy to be aimless and to drift cynically or sadly.

Let us look at that other picture which clears up the tormenting mystery, the picture of the Great Master, Jesus Christ, which St. Paul put in a cosmic frame. Which picture do we want—the one which makes life a hopeless groping or the one that makes life a Divinely conducted and transformed experience? We must choose. We should choose now before the maze of things becomes overwhelming. Here is what the Apostle says, 'So richly has God lavished his grace upon us! He has granted us complete insight and understanding of the open secret of his will,' explained the puzzle of life, revealed its meaning,

laid bare His world-plan. What makes sense of life and pulls its straggling elements together into an intelligent unity which we can face with confidence and zest is that God has a purpose for us. 'I have called thee by thy name, thou art mine.' 'He hath chosen us to be holy and blameless before Him, destining us in love to be His sons through Jesus Christ.' That is where the individual comes in, and personal religion organizes scattered aims and impulses round one centre, Christ.

But this personal experience of God's purpose in Christ is not the 'complete insight and understanding of the open secret of His will.' It is too limited, too detached from tremendous events around us to steady us when the world is going to pieces. What is going to happen to mankind? That is what we want to know. So our view is enlarged, and we discover that God's purpose has a vaster range, a cosmic horizon. When Jesus Christ rose again a new humanity began, which would overcome all forces hostile to Christ, and the nucleus of this new humanity was the Church, which united Jew and Gentile and thus foretold how the barriers of language and nationalism would be dissolved in a widening fellowship of believing hearts. God's purpose would be realized not only individually but also collectively, and 'the complete insight and understanding' of it was not merely personal devotion to Christ but experience of Him as the saving public spirit of the universe and confidence in the vast sweep of His impact on the souls of men. This thing was not done in a corner but will reach into every corner.

But is Jesus Christ the last word? A man may shake his head at that, and argue that the Carpenter of Nazareth, who lived in Palestine nearly 2000 years ago, must have been limited by His age, and there have been such revolutionary changes in the whole structure of life since then that a more comprehensive and up-to-date revelation of God is to be expected. The man is looking for a more final picture. But the finality of Christ is timeless and universal, because it is the finality of perfect character, supreme vision, and victorious self-sacrifice, not for friends but for enemies. 'While we were yet sinners,' triumphant and insolent in our sins, 'Christ died for us.' Such are the spiritual dimensions of Christ, and He is so far from being superseded that no one since has approximated to His height. Further, He is not out-thought and out-lived, but attests Himself as the Master of all times and all races, and His supremacy is proved, not by the strained effort of men to believe in Him in spite of ugly facts, but by His power to impress men, create in them such an unreserved faith in Him from age to age that, when state-systems and thought-systems collapse, men find in Him a fresh value, a new authority, a saving power not recognized before. He is always contemporary. That reveals His finality as the key to the future and the goal of creation. We turn to the picture of the Master to pull life together and give it new promise, and all other pictures are dwarfed by His greatness.

'So richly has God lavished his grace upon us! He has granted us complete insight and understanding of the open secret of his will.' St. Paul's conclusion as to the finality of Christ was not merely a personal discovery, but a Divine revelation, not simply what he had thought out by himself, but what had gripped him by the grace of God and was made known to him in his experience of Christ.¹

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Aspiration and Awareness.

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL CHARLES S. DUTHIE,
B.D., EDINBURGH.

'Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.'—Mt 5⁶.

'I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.'—Jn 6³⁶.

In a recent broadcast talk Mr. T. S. Eliot gave us an interesting analysis of the work of Charles Williams, the religious writer. What was the secret of the spell that Williams cast upon those who were able to receive his message? It was nothing less, Eliot said, than the quality of *spiritual awareness*. And then Eliot went on to make this striking comment. 'There are many good Christians to-day who believe in spiritual reality but have no experience of it; their Christianity is rather an aspiration than an awareness.' These words make a suggestive commentary on the two statements of Jesus which form our text. 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness'—that is aspiration. But aspiration is not intended to end in aspiration. Aspiration alone is like a question without an answer, a preface without a story to follow it. Aspiration finds fulfilment in awareness. Here is the promise of the awareness—'they shall be filled. . . . I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.'

I suppose that when we begin to think of spiritual aspiration and awareness our minds turn naturally to those who are not yet within the orbit of the fellowship of the Church. We judge them, as far as the spiritual world is concerned, to be more or less unaware; but at the same time many of them are far from being unaspiring. They sometimes glimpse a higher way than the way they are following and become restless and dissatisfied. Days come when this restlessness is so strong that they begin to wonder whether Christians are not right in describing it as a homesickness for God. A recent writer has said of many such 'Theirs is not an intellectual problem. They cannot be reached by books or arguments. Yet they are hungry, often without knowing it, for what Christianity has to offer.' They may not have come to what Jesus calls *hungering and thirsting after righteousness*; but their feet are on the road. It is natural and right that we

¹ A. A. Cowan, *Captain of the Storm*, 163.

should think of such folk first; for it is a major part of the task of the Church to turn their vague aspiration into clear and strong awareness, to confront them with the living and life-giving Lord, so that from being utterly dissatisfied with themselves they come to be entirely satisfied with Him.

But I am speaking to those who are within the Church and own allegiance to it. The question I want to ask is this: 'Can we hope to change the outsider's trembling longing for certainty into vital awareness, if we ourselves have not reached that certainty? Can we communicate the glory of possessing Christ unless it glows and burns in our own hearts? Can we convince men that Christ is the Bread of Life if we ourselves look sorry and under-nourished Christians?' I was speaking recently to an ex-Serviceman, full of splendid idealism. Christianity, he was sure, was the only hope for the world. He thought of devoting his life to some special form of Christian ministry. But when we came to talk of the great Christian business of getting the gospel over to people and getting the gospel into people, he confessed himself to be at a loss. He did not know where to start. Further thought made it clear to him that his fundamental lack was the lack of any sense of God as a personal reality, forgiving, renewing, empowering, directing him. He had aspiration but little or no awareness, although in the Providence of God it turned out to be an aspiration that led him to awareness. In that notable Report, *Towards the Conversion of England*, it is stated that the 'paramount spiritual need of the non-worshipping members of the community is the recovery of their consciousness of God.' But it is a paramount need of the worshipping members as well. Only the spiritually aware can help others to become aware. If others are to catch the vision from us we must ourselves have seen that vision. If we are to lead them into living pastures, we must ourselves be feeding on the Bread of Life.

The promise of our Lord is that if we genuinely seek we shall find, if we ask it shall be given us, if we knock the door will be opened, if we hunger we shall be satisfied, if we aspire we shall become aware. How could it be otherwise? God is our Father and loves to reward the quest of His children. But there is another side to the medalion. God means all our aspiration to lead to awareness, but He also looks for our awareness to give rise to stronger and stronger aspiration. When Jesus spoke of being filled He was thinking not of an act that can be completed but of a continuing process. Our spiritual awareness only remains awareness as it is full of intense longing not only for the betterment of our own discipleship but for the coming of God's rule in God's world.

We need, therefore, to ask ourselves 'Is my spiritual awareness an awareness that is full of aspiration? Do I really hunger and thirst for goodness? Can I honestly say with the Psalmist 'As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God?' These words of Jesus about hungering and thirsting

after righteousness are among the most searching in the whole range of the Gospels. Do I want to be good with every fibre of me or only to be thought good? Am I prepared for pain in growing into the likeness of Christ or do I seek a swift and easy passage to Christian character? Our trouble so often is that we are not resolutely and even desperately set on goodness. It has been wisely said that God judges us not so much by what we are as by what we long for. It is an axiom of the Christian life that the only spiritual hunger that is ever satisfied is the spiritual hunger that is never satisfied. 'Brethren,' writes Paul, with his eye on those who were inclined to forget that if the Christian is on the right road it is a road on which he has an infinite distance to travel, who prided themselves on having a kind of spiritual awareness that needed no aspiration to make it complete, 'I count not myself to have apprehended. I haven't arrived. I am still journeying. There is just one thing to do, and I am trying to do it. I am pressing on.' Spiritual awareness? Listen! 'I know whom I have believed. . . . I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me. . . . I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' This is vivid and contagious awareness, but it is always linked with an intense, unwavering aspiration. He wishes himself accursed from Christ for his brethren's sake. He dreams until the end of new lands conquered for Christ in the West. He yearns passionately for that final deliverance from evil which only the might of God can accomplish. Paul's aspiration was always yielding new awareness and his awareness giving birth to fresh and stronger aspiration. This is the authentic mark of the truly Christian life.

Here is a pointer to the twofold task of the Christian Church. That task is to turn aspiration into awareness and to fill awareness with aspiration. It is to satisfy the soul's hunger and to create a new hunger in it. Dr. Theodore Green, writing in *The Christian Answer*, says 'Christianity is faced to-day with a gigantic dual task, that of persuading a sceptical and secular age of the truth and power of the Christian gospel, and that of revitalizing and re-orienting the Christian Church.' The second part of the task he regards as the more urgent, although both must be tackled at the same time. If the salt has lost its savour it must somehow find it again. 'The dire omen for us all,' wrote Bernanos in his noble plea for liberty during his exile from France in the recent World War, 'yes, for us all, believers and unbelievers, is not fewer Christians but the increasing number of mediocre Christians.' Mediocre Christians must be replaced by militant and magnetic Christians if the Church is to present her message with striking power.

And the way to this? We know at least the beginning and the end of it, although much lies between. It is to present Christ Himself, the living Lord, in whom God comes to meet us and to offer us a new life. His love and companionship alone can still our restlessness. The witness of the centuries is that He wholly satisfies the

longing soul ; and in satisfying it He gives to it a new and better restlessness, a hunger for God and righteousness, a divine urge to Christian action, a yearning to take this sorry scheme of things entire and mould it nearer to the heart's desire for God. 'I am the bread of life,' He says, 'he that cometh to me shall never hunger ; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' In fellowship with Him life becomes an awareness and an endless aspiration. We are satisfied and never satisfied. We live by faith and hope until in the unveiled vision of God we shall know even as we have been known and our longing shall be laid to rest in full and unbroken communion with God.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Sacrifice of Thanksgiving.

By THE REVEREND ROBERT MENZIES, D.D., GLASGOW.

'In everything give thanks ; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus to you-ward.'—I Th 5¹⁸ (R.V.).

One of the most impressive features of Paul's Epistles is the pre-eminent place given to thanksgiving. Paul is always thanking God for His unspeakable gift of the gospel, for his co-workers in the service of the gospel, for the fruits of the gospel in his converts, for the oppositions and sufferings he encountered in the furtherance of the gospel. Even in his most massive arguments in defence of the gospel, from time to time he halts his logic, and breaks into pure thanksgiving. The strain of his spirit furnishes the pattern in which all our lives should be cast.

To begin with, and in the most elementary sense, thanksgiving is *the recognition that is due from a dependent creature to a bountiful Creator*. For whether we acknowledge it or not, we are all pensioners on God's bounty. It is from Him we derive our being, well-being, and all the blessings of this life. Every rightly disposed person ought to feel an irrepressible urge to return thanks for this glorious heritage of life. R. L. Stevenson spent a night among the pines, where he had been hospitably entertained and punctually served in his green caravanserai. 'I felt I was in some one's debt for this ideal entertainment. So it pleased me, in a half-laughing way, to lay pieces of money on the ground, till I had paid my night's lodging.' Katherine Mansfield, a sojourner in Switzerland for her health's sake, an avowed unbeliever, yet as she drank in the tonic air of the mountains, and revelled in the loveliness of the woods, wrote to a friend, 'If only one could make some small grasshopper sound of praise to Someone—some thanks to Someone, but who?' The devout soul, with a clearer recognition of the source of all this largesse, feels constrained to give thanks to God Himself. 'Praise ye the Lord : for it is good to sing praises unto our God ; for it is pleasant ; and praise is comely.' Good, pleasant, comely, but also right and necessary. For there is no other fitting sacrifice we can offer Him. We cannot enrich His being by any gifts of ours. He already possesses all, and abounds. The one sacrifice which is ours to give, which God desires and which is pleasant in

His sight is the offering of our grateful thanks. 'If I were a nightingale,' said Epictetus, 'I would pour out my soul in song to Him, but, being just an old man, what shall I do but praise and bless Him as I can.' Have we risen as high as this in the scale of grace? If not, by what claim of right do we presume to appropriate God's gifts without even acknowledging the Giver.

We ought further to observe the vital way in which *thanksgiving affects the life of prayer*. It is the soil in which the seeds of prayer germinate and grow. It is significant that the exhortation given here to 'pray without ceasing' is flanked on the one side by the command to 'rejoice evermore' and on the other 'in everything to give thanks.' Those are the two wings on which prayer mounts to God. Halyburton, the Scottish saint, prescribes thankfulness as a specific for dryness of soul. He himself was frequently gruelled by his low spirits and disinclination to prayer. In his *Memoirs* he writes: 'I find a law that always, even when in the lowest depths, I can pull myself back into the sunshine through the duty of thankfulness.' But not only does it dispose us rightly towards God, but it also vitalizes every exercise of prayer. It enriches pure adoration to God by putting positive content into this act of prayer. It makes our confession more poignant and realistic because to sin against a love which should evoke only gratitude, makes our sin infinitely more heinous. It also encourages petition, since we acquire boldness in the presence of one whom we have found in experience to be a giving God. It also aligns us with all our fellow-beings, because the gifts which call forth our gratitude are seen to be not our personal preserve, but the intention of God for all His creatures. That is why we find that in the New Testament thanksgiving and intercession are joined together. 'I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men.' In ways like these thanksgiving is seen to be the oxygen of prayer, quickening and enlivening all its parts, giving point to Paul's exhortation, 'Maintain your zest for prayer by thanksgiving.'

Once again the prayer of thanksgiving *possesses the virtue of giving us the victory over the disabilities of life*. 'In everything give thanks,' is the counsel of Paul to a persecuted and suffering Church. And that 'everything' includes impoverishments as well as enrichments, shadow as well as light. This is a severe test of character, and only those who possess a faith which thankfully accepts all that comes to them as the will of God can meet it. That is why Paul adds the interpreting clause, 'This is the will of God in Christ Jesus to you-ward,' or as Ronald Knox translates it, 'This is what God expects of you as Christians.' Montaigne expresses his astonishment at the hilarious reactions of the saints to the miseries of life, and adds that, for himself, they only make him curse. Paul shows us the more excellent way. He himself illustrated the counsel he enforced on others. He mastered the secret of giving God thanks in everything. Like the sweet spring water that bubbles up in the sands by the

seashore, and mingles with the salt sea waves, so a fountain of inextinguishable gratitude gushed up in his heart to sweeten the bitter waters of his experience. To be sure, he had his reasons for this gallant response to life's contradictions. There was not a bitter cross he had to bear but carried in his heart some compensating gain. Was he a prisoner in bonds, then his bonds turned out rather to the furtherance of the gospel. Was he broken-hearted at the moral failure of the Corinthian Church, that broken-heartedness invited the rich comfort of Christ, which, when received, made him the distributor of a like comfort to others. Did his plans go awry, his programme become disarranged, and his hopes blighted, he still rejoiced in the assurance 'that all things work together for good to them that love God.' Even if the weight of his sufferings became intolerable he reflected that at their worst they were merely transitory, 'not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.' A spirit like this that thanks God even for defeat is beyond the reach of defeat. It turns the flank of every opposing force, converts enemies into allies, and leads captivity captive.

Do we possess a faith like this, which produces a spirit of thankfulness under the most depressing circumstances? Trench reminds us that there are some who murmur when in a blue sky one speck of cloud appears. But there are others whose hearts are filled with thankful love if 'but one streak of light, one ray of God's mercy, gilds the darkness of the night.' These are the excellent in all the earth, who have caught the infection of Christ's spirit and that of His great Apostle. A fine example of this is that dramatic scene which Carlyle depicts as taking place at Cromwell's death-bed. The political horizon was dark. The Protector's daughter was dead. The State was disintegrating for lack of leadership. 'Dark hues and bright; immortal light-beams struggled amid the black vapours of death.' And Cromwell suddenly looked up and asks of the mourning group around him, 'Is there none that will come and "praise God"?' 'In everything give thanks.'

Finally, and above and beyond all other causes for thankfulness is *the contemplation of the over-*

flowing goodness of God in the knowledge-surpassing gift of His Son to the human race. This is 'the topmost, ineffablest crown' of all God's gifts, in which all others are included. It is the sense of the surpassing value of this gift which fills the New Testament with light and radiance. There is a marked difference between the Old and the New Testament in feeling and outlook. The music of the Old Testament is often set in the minor key. Its song comes fluttering and uncertain. The hearts of its writers are dashed with fears as well as hopes. Their lyrics are frequently mingled with dirges. But the New Testament is set in the major key from beginning to end. Its heroes sing songs at midnight in the innermost prison. They have their problems, but they are certain they have the key to their solution in their hands. Sin abounds, but grace much more abounds. Death reigns but it is swallowed up of life. All the closed roads to God lie wide open, and before them gleams a light 'that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.' It is Jesus who has made all this difference, and the sense of His preciousness fills the souls of His adoring followers with a rapture of thankfulness.

Are our lives pitched in this key? Are we sincerely thankful for the love of God revealed in Jesus Christ our Lord? Are we more grateful to God for the gift of Christ than for our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life? Is He to us the Pearl of great price, for the purchase of which we are eager to sell all that we have? Can we sing with the redeemed in heaven, 'Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever?' This is the acid test of the reality of our Christian faith. Our growth in thankfulness is the measure of our growth in grace.

'In everything give thanks.' Let us begin with something, anything, for which we can sincerely praise God, for if we never thank God for anything in particular we shall never learn to thank Him in everything. And as Christians let us in particular thank God for the gift of His Son, for what He has done, is now doing, and will continue to do for us, in us, and through us.

Contributions and Comments.

The Prophets and Sacrifice.

PROFESSOR SNAITH returns to the question of the prophetic attitude to sacrifice in a recent issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES,¹ and suggests that the reason for the modern attempts to show that the prophets were not antagonistic to sacrifice is a renewed interest in liturgies and rituals, or a revolt from easy-going and inadequate theories of the

¹ March 1947, p. 152 f., 'The Prophets and Sacrifice and Salvation.'

Atonement. May one who recognizes that the prophets denounced the religiosity and the sacrifices of their own day, but who has had some share in resisting the view that they condemned sacrifices as such, and who, in view of a recent attack on him on this subject in the pages of this magazine,² may not be wholly out of Professor Snaith's mind, and may be in the mind of some of his readers, be permitted to say that he belongs to the least

² C. J. Cadoux, 'The Religious Value of Sacrifice' [November, 1946, pp. 43-46]. Cf. the reply in the December 1946 issue, pp. 69-71.

liturgical and ritualistic of churches, and to the least liturgical and ritualistic section of his church, and that so far from his views on the prophets being dictated by his views on the Atonement, the process in his case has been rather the reverse? There was a time when he publicly accepted the view that the prophets opposed the ritual in itself,¹ and at that time he tacitly ignored all the sacrificial element in the New Testament interpretation of the Cross. Fuller study of the prophets convinced him that they were not so radically opposed to the ritual, and it was only at a later date that he perceived the significance of this for the understanding of the New Testament and returned to let it speak to him with its own voice. Not on *a priori* grounds, but on objective grounds, he declines to make the antithesis between the prophets and Judaism, out of whose womb Christianity emerged, quite so sharp as some would make it. If from either side there is any attempt to see the prophets in our own image, scholarship is sacrificed. It is wiser to try to see them as they were, and to recognize that they were not men of our age and are not to be converted into such.

It is not denied, and cannot be denied, that the pre-exilic canonical prophets condemned the sacrifices of their day; what is denied is that they condemned them because they were sacrifices, and not because they were offered by men who in their hearts and in their lives would have none of the will of God, and who fondly supposed that as mere *opera operata* their sacrifices were powerful. If one to-day should say that no man could be saved by going to church, it would be hard if he should be misrepresented as having said that it was wrong to go to church.

In fact, however, it is hard to see just what Professor Snaith's view is. For despite the forthrightness with which he attacks, in the first part of his article, the views of those who deny that the prophets were implacably opposed to sacrifice as such, he later joins them, and even goes beyond the point where the present writer would rest. He says, 'It is extremely likely that the Prophets were minded to be as faithful as any one else in ritual sacrifices.'² This is very doubtful. It is probable that the prophets condemned the sacrifices of their day because they were mere sacrifices, *opera operata* conceived of as having power in themselves whether or no they were the organ of the worship of the offerer. It is wholly unlikely that they contemplated a non-sacrificial religion. But their emphasis on what was lacking in the religion of their day is so strong that they are not likely to have taken any extensive part in the sacrifices of their time.

It is more particularly the earlier part of his article, however, with its less guarded statements, which is challenged here, since the admission to which attention has been called is hardly likely to overturn the impression it has built up.

So far Professor Snaith has been followed in his facile identification of a few of the canonical prophets with 'the Prophets,' and dismissal of the

rest. It must, however, be observed that our study of the prophets must be more *nuancée* than this. Professor Snaith somewhat contemptuously dismisses the post-exilic prophets as men who were growing into apocalyptists. Actually the seeds of apocalyptic are to be found in older prophets, and Professor Snaith himself later notes that the messages of the Prophets and of the apocalyptists were not wholly unrelated. Moreover, Samuel was a pre-exilic prophet; and Samuel was not opposed to sacrifice as such. Elijah was a prophet, to whose prophetic worth the New Testament bears witness; and Elijah was not opposed to sacrifice as such, despite Professor Snaith's quiet annexation of him for the side of those who had a rooted objection to sacrifice! Again, we must not forget the cultic prophets, to whom attention has been drawn in recent years,³ who were hardly opposed to sacrifice as such. Not even the pre-exilic prophets can be conveniently fitted into a single mould, and even if the eighth-century prophets and Jeremiah were opposed to sacrifice as such, it would be a false generalization which says 'The Prophets have no word in favour' of sacrifice.⁴

It is too easily forgotten that the great passage in Is 1 includes much more than sacrifice in its condemnation. It equally condemns repair to the Temple, Sabbath observance and prayer. It can hardly be supposed that these were wrong in themselves. Let it be remembered that in the eighth century B.C. there was no synagogue, and the only public expression of religion then known centred in the shrines. There is not the slightest evidence that the prophets organized any alternative expression of corporate worship, while if Isaiah held that prayer was in itself sinful and an offence to God, he must have opposed even private worship as iniquitous. If he really taught such nonsense, he was a poor religious teacher. But in that case let us recognize him as such. Yet where is the evidence? The passage denounces the sacrifice and the Temple-going and the Sabbath-keeping and prayer of men whose hands are filled with blood. If the prophet meant that his word had equal relevance to those whose hands were not filled with blood, why did he mention this completely irrelevant matter? To suppose that he teaches that men who flout the will of God in their lives and reject Him from their hearts nullify their worship, whether it takes the form of sacrifice, repair to the shrine, Sabbath observance or prayer, is not dictated by love of ritual but by common sense, and the simple assumption that the prophet did not idly cloud the issue by dropping in irrelevances, but meant the whole of what he said.

In Is 19¹⁸ there is a prophecy of the day when there should be an altar to the Lord in Egypt. This is commonly denied to Isaiah and ascribed to a much later age. The same verse refers to a pillar (מִצְבֵּה) to the Lord, and those who ascribe

³ Cf. A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* [1944], and 'The Prophet in Israelite Worship,' in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, April 1936, pp. 312-319.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*, p. 152.

¹ Cf. *The Baptist Quarterly*, January 1932, p. 12.

² *Loc. cit.*, p. 152.

the passage to a late post-exilic date are at pains to square this with the Deuteronomic prohibition of the *זֶבֶחַ* by arguing that it was here a memorial stele. That it stands in parallelism with the altar sufficiently indicates its religious character and association with the altar, and the verse is more naturally taken as a pre-Deuteronomic passage, precisely as Hos 3⁴, which similarly knows no objection to the *זֶבֶחַ*. If it is genuinely Isaianic, it indicates that the Prophet was not opposed to the altar as such, while if it is pre-Deuteronomic, whether it is Isaianic or not, it is relevant to the discussion of the pre-exilic prophets' view of sacrifice.

But whatever be the case with this passage, the case of Hos 3^{4f} is even clearer. For there the Prophet represents it as a mark of the Divine discipline that Israel shall be temporarily deprived of king and altar. To refer to Hos 6⁶ alone for Hosea's attitude to sacrifice is insufficient.

Nor does Professor Snaith face up to the fact that Deuteronomy is generally recognized to rest on the teachings of the eighth-century prophets, and the equally important fact that the prophetic books were edited and collected and treasured in the post-exilic age which he appears to regard as hostile to their fundamental teaching. Deuteronomy does not regard sacrifices as evil in themselves, and if the common view that Jeremiah at first supported the Deuteronomic reform is true, there was a time in his career when Jeremiah did not. On Jer 7^{22f} and 6^{19f}, there is no need to add anything to what was said in an earlier article.¹ Here suffice it to observe that it is improbable that the compilers of Deuteronomy rejected the fundamental teaching of the prophets on whose message they based their work, or that the post-exilic community either misunderstood the message of the pre-exilic prophets or took pains to preserve what they believed to be dangerous error.

One further fact may be mentioned. The New Testament records that our Lord cleansed lepers and told them to present themselves at the Temple and offer the prescribed sacrifices. Either He regarded sacrifices as being in themselves an offence to God or He did not. If He did so regard them,

¹ THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, December 1946, p. 70.

we must suppose that He deliberately encouraged these men to commit such an offence. If He did not so regard them, must we class Him with those post-exilic prophets who were growing into apocalyptists whom Professor Snaith so lightly dismisses, and believe that He was of lesser stature than the pre-exilic prophets who 'have no word in favour' of sacrifice? Or do we run the risk of being labelled ritualists if we prefer a more reasonable course?

H. H. ROWLEY.

Manchester.

St. Luke ix. 57-62.

IN his sermon to the boys of Malvern College, and re-printed in the January issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, the Rev. W. H. Murray Walton expounds Lk 9⁵⁷⁻⁶² and takes the popular view that the would-be discipleship of the three followers of Christ did not materialize. While this is, indeed, the popular theory and might quite easily be assumed in the case of No. 2 and No. 3, it is not nearly so evident in the case of No. 1. It is important to notice that he offered himself of his own free will without any invitation by Christ and in the parallel passage in Mt 8¹², to which Mr. Walton refers, as in St. Luke's account, there is no suggestion that he did not follow up his offer by actual discipleship. Mr. Walton admits that he was evidently a man of sincere intentions and being a scribe was also of some intellectual standing, and it seems quite likely that being well aware of what he was doing and in spite of the stern challenge laid down before him he did follow the Master in full discipleship. At least he might have the benefit of the doubt. The 'but' in his case falls from Christ's lips, not his own. Also, in the case of No. 2 and No. 3, while the 'but' does come from them, there is no plain statement that they too did not in the end accept the challenge of full discipleship. May not these three instances, and especially the first one, be occasions when the 'silence' of the Scriptures speaks volumes. After all, it must be remembered that at the day of Pentecost there were a large number of disciples (Ac 1¹⁵).

J. R. CROCKFORD.

London.

Entre Nous.

Belsen and Auschwitz.

Straight On, by Dr. Robert Collis and Miss Han Hogerzeil (Methuen; 10s. 6d. net), is the story of the 'Horror' Camps at Belsen and Auschwitz and of the heroic work of doctors and soldiers in succouring and bringing back to health those of the victims who were capable of restoration. It is a horrible record and an inspiring one. It is horrible to read the description of the condition of the inmates of these Camps, many of whom

were beyond help. Things were so bad that the British soldiers of the liberating army in their fury beat up the Camp officials, made them bury the dead, and fed them on the rations they had given to the Camp inmates. The two chapters describing these vile spots were taken down from the raconteurs, who had gone through their tortures with incredible courage, and carefully checked with the official records. Otherwise it would be difficult to believe the facts stated. Dr. Robert Collis, who writes the story, is a well-known Irish

children's physician and he it was, aided by doctors, medical students, and soldiers of the rescuing army, who brought help and hope and life in what the doctor calls 'the most extraordinary liberation in the history of the world.' To nurse back to health as many as possible of the seventeen thousand persons in Belsen Camp alone was one of the most difficult tasks that have ever been undertaken by a group of medical men. Their devotion, patience, courage, and kindness were beyond conventional praise.

And in this tribute we must include the British common soldier. 'I would like to say one thing,' remarked an observer of these events. 'The greatest asset England has . . . is the British private soldier. I have known him for twenty years in every part of the world. He talks a language of his own; it is not English, but everybody understands him. See him anywhere from Colombo to Malta, see the crowd of people, the children around him, and you know where the greatness of England lies.' And Dr. Collis tells of two incidents that illustrate this verdict. One was at a party given to the convalescents who were slowly recovering strength after their terrible experiences. Some could hardly walk, others looked as if they'd break in two. But every soldier took a girl on his brawny arm. The girls looked so happy, it was hard for onlookers not to smile or cry. 'Never, perhaps,' says Dr. Collis, 'have those British private soldiers done more to make the name of England loved than that evening when these victorious men who had stormed across the Rhine danced with the despised and outcast of the earth.' The other incident was as characteristic. One afternoon a private soldier from an English infantry regiment approached the doctor and handed him a brown-paper parcel. 'It's like this, doctor,' he said, 'Corporal Smith, 'e says to me, 'e says—be sure and give it to the doc., 'e says, 'cos it might make the kids sick. You see, Sir, Corporal Smith is a family man like, if you see what I mean.' The doctor could not say he did, but by then he had untied the parcel. It contained the platoon's complete, saved-up chocolate ration for three weeks. The doctor was at the time in charge of the children's hospital.

It is good to have the hideous facts about these Camps put on record, and it is infinitely good to have such a story as this of the almost incredible bravery of some of the inmates and of the loving-kindness and steadfast, resolute, patient courage of the liberators and redeemers. F. J. RAE.

The Redemption of Europe.

Now I looked down and saw that we were flying over the ruins of Hamburg, the gutted city. . . . and I remembered how we'd toiled together there: Johnston the steadfast Scot, David the brave American, Berger our gentle colleague . . . the

British and the Irish who had not always been friends, the French fathers of the Vatican Mission, the wonderful British, the jolly Belgian medical students, the gallant Dutch, our beloved Swiss doctors, the Czechs, the Poles, the northern Swedish men, and yes, that German surgeon who had saved Olga's life—what was it we had found in common, surmounting our own nationalities? Surely it was a feeling that we all belonged to the same old culture of ancient Christendom, and before that, of Rome and Greece. Europeans, that was what we were. . . . Behind all our thoughts lay the same tradition. Surely we had found there a super-nationality that transcended and yet did not interfere with our own. Surely we had found and formed a brotherhood, the essential principle of which must be the basis of any new world-order. . . . Once this super-nationality was created, it would be possible to rebuild a new Europe. Then the question as to how we should re-educate the Germans would solve itself, for now German re-education would be part of the general re-education when we would start to teach our children, not of their hereditary enemies but of their common heritage handed down to them from Plato, Leonardo, St. John of the Cross, Rembrandt, Shakespeare, Pasteur, Shaw, Tolstoi, and all the rest.¹

Conference on the Christian Ministry.

Under the auspices of the Society for the Equal Ministry of Men and Women in the Church (Inter-denominational) a Conference is being held at St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, from 8th to 12th September. The Chairman of the Conference is Professor L. W. Grensted, D.D., and excellent speakers have been secured, including Professor C. E. Raven, Professor S. L. Greenslade, Professor G. D. Henderson, the Rev. Geoffrey Nuttall, Professor Leonard Hodgson, the Rev. Deaconess Dorothea Belfield, and Miss Mildred Cable.

Those who wish to attend the Conference should send a registration fee of 5s. to 'The Secretary, S.E.M.C., Room 44A, 25 Victoria Street, London, S.W.1.'

¹ Robert Collis and Han Hogerzeil, *Straight On*.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland